

Edward J. Fleming, Cochranston.
 Minnie E. Lewis, Covington.
 Charles H. Lapsley, Glassport.
 Grace S. Albright, Hyndman.
 Jules C. Luyten, Indianola.
 Samuel L. Boyer, Library.
 William E. Schaeffer, Manorville.
 Albert R. Morgan, Nemaquin.
 Samuel S. Ulerich, New Florence.
 Walter D. Gibson, Renton.
 Herbert O. Hornbake, South Brownsville.
 Emma E. Forster, Wall.
 Jenny Paterson, Yukon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, December 19, 1924

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, our faith looks up to Thee. Again the silver cord has been loosed and the golden bowl broken. One whose mind was alert, whose spirit was aggressive, whose energy was untiring, whose genial presence and wholesome manner we loved, such a one has passed this way for the last time. He was a wise counselor and servant of the public. Comfort the bereaved loved ones with hopes and promises of the infinite beyond, where earth's music shall be gathered into one undying song and the bonds of eternal love never broken. Thank God for the realm beyond the shadows where the sun never sets and the stars never fade and the rainbow never dies out of the everlasting skies. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MADDEN, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 10982) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report (No. 1056), was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered printed.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves all points of order on the bill.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 3509. An act to change the time for the holding of terms of court in the eastern district of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSENBLOOM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 10650. An act to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Republic of Lithuania to the United States of America;

H. R. 10651. An act to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Republic of Poland to the United States of America, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6941. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 8657. An act to amend section 98 of the Judicial Code, providing for the holding of the United States district court at Shelby, N. C.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communications, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, D. C., December 17, 1924.

Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLET, *Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign from membership on the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES L. GIFFORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, D. C., December 18, 1924.

Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLET, *Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT M. LEACH.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO VACANCIES ON COMMITTEES

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the vacancy caused by the resignation, just read, of Mr. LEACH from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall be filled by the appointment of Mr. GIFFORD, and that the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. GIFFORD from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures be given to Mr. LEACH.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered. There was no objection.

JOINT INAUGURATION COMMITTEE

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 23, relating to the appointment of a joint committee of the two Houses to make arrangements for the inauguration of the President elect on the 4th of March next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 23, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 23

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President elect of the United States on the 4th of March next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the joint committee on the part of the House Mr. GRIEST, Mr. HADLEY, and Mr. ROUSE.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10724) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] will resume the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10724) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10724, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10724) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will continue the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT, BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

For tolls and ferriages; purchase of books and stationery; hygienic and sanitary investigation and illustration; sanitary, hygienic, and special instruction, including the issuing of naval medical bulletins and supplements; purchase and repairs of nonpassenger-carrying wagons, automobile ambulances, and harness; purchase of and feed for horses and cows; maintenance, repair, and operation of three passenger-carrying motor vehicles for naval dispensary, Washington, D. C., and of one motor-propelled vehicle for official use only for the medical officer on out-patient medical service at the Naval Academy; trees, plants, care of grounds, garden tools, and seeds; incidental articles for the Naval Medical School and naval dispensary, Washington, naval medical supply depots, sick quarters at Naval Academy and marine barracks; washing for medical department and Naval Medical School and naval dispensary, Washington, naval medical supply depots, sick quarters at Naval Academy and marine barracks, dispensaries at navy yards and naval stations and ships; and for minor repairs on buildings and grounds of the United States Naval Medical School and naval medical supply depots; rent of rooms for naval dispensary, Washington, D. C., not to exceed \$1,200; for the care, maintenance, and treatment of the insane of the Navy and Marine Corps on the Pacific coast, including supernumeraries held for transfer to the Government Hospital for the Insane; for dental outfits and dental material; and all other necessary contingent expenses; in all, \$375,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUTLER: Page 34, line 11, after the amount insert "Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to construct necessary additional buildings at the naval hospitals at Chelsea, Mass.; Newport, R. I.; New York, N. Y.; League Island, Pa.; Norfolk, Va.; Great Lakes, Ill.; Puget Sound, Wash.; Guam, and Canacao, P. I., at a total cost not to exceed \$790,500, which total expenditure for the purposes aforesaid shall be made from the naval hospital fund."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, unauthorized by law, and that it is for new construction and a change of existing law unauthorized. I will reserve it if the gentleman from Pennsylvania desires to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is entirely right on the point of order.

We ask only what is absolutely necessary for the men to have, to take care of the sick in the Navy.

This money does not come from the Treasury of the United States. It is a contribution made by the boys themselves, of 20 cents a month and fines and forfeitures imposed upon them. The fund has now grown until it is between \$4,000,000 and \$5,000,000. It is necessary to fix up some of those institutions. The estimate was not handed to us in time, otherwise we would have introduced a bill and asked the House to pass it unanimously. This money belongs to the boys themselves, to provide better shelter and nurses to attend the sick. They own it all themselves.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman could see some of the statistics that I have in my office, showing right now the number of vacancies in Government-operated hospitals from one end of the United States to the other, he would not want to embark on this enlarged building program for hospitals.

Mr. BUTLER. I know my friend is not for extravagance, and I want him to accord me the same disposition.

Mr. BLANTON. We have no opportunity now to discuss and debate a building program such as the gentleman is offering here.

Mr. BUTLER. This is only an addition and not new places. I want to say this to my friend: That the Veterans' Bureau is sending many of its sick people to these hospitals, and we must provide for them.

Mr. BLANTON. The Veterans' Bureau now has a surplus of beds all over the United States within its own hospitals.

Mr. BUTLER. I have said all I can say. This is asked by the department through the Surgeon General of the Navy, a very careful, economical man, Admiral Stitt, and whatever

Admiral Stitt recommends to us impresses us as being necessary.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is always able to get the ear of the House for his legislative committee whenever he wants it. Why not take this up in the regular way and thrash it out?

Mr. BUTLER. I will be as candid in answering the gentleman, and say I am afraid we will not have an opportunity to pass such a bill through both bodies in this short session, and these accommodations ought to be given to these sick people.

Mr. BLANTON. I regret exceedingly, Mr. Chairman, but I insist on my point of order.

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman from Texas withhold it for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly; I will withhold it.

Mr. FRENCH. Does the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania include only the items that came to the Appropriations Committee from the Budget?

Mr. BUTLER. None other. They are items passed upon by the Budget, recommended by the department, and first submitted to the Appropriations Committee, which could not include them in the appropriation bill because they include a piece of legislation. The Appropriations Committee asked the Naval Affairs Committee to hold a hearing on these items, which we did, and that committee very cheerfully and immediately unanimously recommended them.

Mr. FRENCH. I believe I voice the sentiment of the committee when I say that the members of the committee were attracted by the necessity for these several additions, but we had no authority and for that reason did not include the items in the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. And did not put them in the bill because they are legislation.

Mr. FRENCH. We had no authority.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman did include some legislative items in the bill which likewise he had no authority to put in. There are several pieces of legislation in the bill to which I could call the gentleman's attention.

Mr. FRENCH. If the gentleman will call attention to them when the time comes I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows some of the items to which I refer. I have not made points of order against them but I have let them go by.

Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman from Texas will withhold his point of order a little longer—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I think we should get along with the bill. We all understand the situation, and I insist on my point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that the proposed amendment contains legislation.

Mr. BUTLER. I concede it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania or the gentleman from Idaho care to discuss the point of order?

Mr. FRENCH. I concede the point of order, but I was hoping it would not be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not desire to be heard on anything at this time, although I am obliged to the Chair. I would like my friend from Texas to hear me, and I am going to reason with him, because he is a reasonable man, and after I have talked with him I do not think he will turn his back on such a worthy undertaking as this.

The CHAIRMAN. All of the decisions on amendments of this character within recent years have sustained the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas, and the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS
MAINTENANCE

For the labor, materials, and supplies necessary, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, for the general maintenance of the activities and properties now or hereafter under the cognizance of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, including the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles for the Naval Establishment not otherwise provided for, and including not to exceed \$950,000 for clerical, inspection, drafting, messenger, and other classified work in the field, \$6,750,000: *Provided*, That during the fiscal year 1926 the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to purchase not more than 2

passenger-carrying motor-propelled vehicles, to cost not to exceed \$2,500 each, 15 passenger-carrying motor-propelled vehicles, to cost not to exceed \$1,500 each, and 30 passenger-carrying motor-propelled vehicles, to cost not to exceed \$500 each, and the Secretary of the Navy shall sell or exchange in part payment for such new vehicles not less than a corresponding number of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles in use and of makes which now cost in excess of \$2,000 per vehicle to replace for each new car purchased costing \$1,500 or more: *Provided further*, That expenditures from appropriations contained in this act for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, including the compensation of operators, shall not exceed in the aggregate \$100,000, exclusive of such vehicles owned and operated by the Marine Corps in connection with expeditionary duty without the continental limits of the United States, and on any one vehicle shall not exceed for maintenance, upkeep, and repair, exclusive of garage rent, pay of operator, fuel, and lubricants, one-third of the market price of a new vehicle of the same make or class, and in any case more than \$500.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move, on page 35, line 19, after the sum of \$6,750,000, to strike out the balance of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 35, beginning with line 20, strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this proposed appropriation for additional automobiles is extravagance gone to seed. If it had not been for some late decisions holding that a department has the right to buy passenger-carrying automobiles without special authority from Congress, when they are given money for it, I would have made a point of order against this part of the paragraph, but, of course, it having been held it is not subject to a point of order, I did not make it. But here is what our committee is asking the Congress to do, to grant authority to the department to buy all of these new passenger-carrying automobiles when the Navy Department now has so many of them it does not know what to do with them.

Let me show what we are authorizing. We are authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to purchase not more than two passenger-carrying automobiles at a cost of \$2,500 each. That is up in the Cadillac class. [Cries of "No!" "No!"] Yes; they are in the Cadillac class, because Cadillacs will be selling at that time for \$2,500 to the Government. You mark my prediction. They are in the Cadillac class, at the special price always made to the Government. What else do we authorize them to do? We authorize them to purchase 15 passenger-carrying motor vehicles to cost not to exceed \$1,500 each. They are in the Studebaker class. Two new Cadillacs and 15 new Studebakers! And then this bill authorizes them to buy 30 passenger-carrying motor-propelled vehicles to cost not exceeding \$500 each. That is up in the Chevrolet class. Here are 2 new Cadillacs, 15 new Studebakers, and 30 new Chevrolet passenger-carrying vehicles given to this department by this paragraph. We have already furnished the Secretary of the Navy with a fine limousine for himself, a \$5,000 limousine possibly, because most of our Cabinet officers have that class of limousines. We have not only furnished most of the admirals with good, fine limousines but now we are preparing to give their bureau chiefs and subchiefs throughout the department passenger-carrying automobiles for their own use.

I am not going to vote for it. You can pass it, I guess, but it is not in accord with the program of economy as set by your President. It is not in accord with the program of economy that caused the people to reelect your President. It is not in accord with the program of economy of your party or of mine, and it ought to stop.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. TABER. Has the gentleman read the hearings on this particular subject?

Mr. BLANTON. I think I have devoted more time and attention to it, possibly, than the gentleman has himself.

Mr. TABER. Perhaps; does the gentleman realize that last year and for several years past \$175,000 was allowed for the operation of these vehicles and that this year we have cut it to \$100,000?

Mr. BLANTON. To \$100,000, yes. Why should you allow them \$100,000 for gasoline and operation?

Mr. TABER. Because it is necessary.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and I can take the gentleman down here right now to the department stores during the next four hours and I can show the gentleman Navy automobiles stand-

ing in front of them and I can show you Navy automobiles coming up in front of the theaters here and discharging passengers, and that ought to stop. Oh, I know that they are our friends. These officers and these bureau chiefs are close personal friends. We sit at the festive banquet table with them. We rub elbows with them. When we have state banquets we join them in marching up the palatial stairs and along the receiving line.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, before attempting to reply to the argument touching the motion, let me suggest in the matter of the last statement made by my colleague that I would be glad to have him bring to the attention of our subcommittee any instances where automobiles are used for purposes other than official. The members of the committee would like to know about them.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Let me finish this statement first. There are strict orders against it. We try to observe the conditions that exist along that line. I think some years ago there were very serious abuses, and it resulted in strict orders on this subject; and if any abuses exist now, I would like to have the matter brought to the attention of our subcommittee.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Briefly.

Mr. BLANTON. I might expect a statement like that from our blind colleague, who is soon to go to the Senate, deservedly, but from the alert gentleman from Idaho I would not expect it. The gentleman surely has not kept his eyes closed here in Washington. If these admirals and these bureau chiefs would drive their own wives to these theaters and department stores I would not care so much, but when they detail fine, splendid young men from the gentleman's district in Idaho and from mine in Texas, who are serving in the Navy, to drive their cars for them as ordinary, menial chauffeurs, I must protest. I do not like it. There is lots of it going on, if the gentleman would investigate.

Mr. FRENCH. If the gentleman will bring to the attention of the committee any cases of the kind to which he refers, the members of the committee will be under obligation to the gentleman. As I said, I personally—

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Let me finish this statement first. I do not believe any such condition as that exists, and I take a great deal of my exercise by walking the streets of Washington to and from my work.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I would like to ask the gentleman for some information.

Mr. FRENCH. I wish first to answer the gentleman from Texas and then I shall be glad to yield.

The Naval Establishment is a great institution. Our Bureau of Yards and Docks alone has to do with valuations that aggregate approximately \$300,000,000. Other activities on the shore aggregate in value another \$300,000,000 in plants. You can not run an institution of that kind, whether it is Government business or business of a private character, unless you have certain tools with which to do the work. One of the tools of an efficient business establishment is the automobile. In a great building plant where you are fabricating ships, materials, and ordnance, where you are going from one part of a station to another, you must have conveyances of this kind if you are going to have anything like efficient work.

What did we find? When we went into the hearings we found the department asking for 10 passenger-carrying, motor-propelled vehicles to cost \$1,500 each and 20 to cost not to exceed \$500 each and 2 to cost not to exceed \$2,500. We raised two of the figures, and why did we raise them? We provide for 15 automobiles instead of 10, to cost not more than \$1,500 each, and 30 instead of 20, to cost not more than \$500 each. Why? We did so because of the expensive way in which the matter is being cared for by the Navy to-day.

We have at this time approximately 160 automobiles of different types in use. A large number of these machines we have inherited from war times. We have, for instance, something like 44 Cadillacs. We have 25 Packards. They were not purchased during recent years. For the most part they were not purchased by the Navy Department at all. Practically all of them were purchased by the War Department during the war and at the end of the war they were transferred to the Navy. They have been in use in the Navy for all these years. It has gotten to a point now where the upkeep on them is enormous. It has gotten to a point now where the upkeep on some of them exceeds \$1,000 a year, and that is not good business. What we have provided in this

bill is in line with the argument of the gentleman touching economy, but we have come to an opposite conclusion from that which he himself has attained. I know the gentleman could not approve of his own conclusion if he had had the opportunity of going into the subject as the members of the committee had in reaching the conclusion that they were compelled to reach from the standpoint of efficiency and economy in the Naval Establishment.

I yield now to my friend from Alabama.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Is there any statute which forbids the use of public vehicles for private purposes?

Mr. BUTLER. There is a law that requires them to be branded.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That is not the point.

Mr. FRENCH. The law requires that the vehicles shall be labeled with letters plainly identifying them as Government owned. The orders are strict touching the use of public vehicles for private purposes. It is easy to make a general statement that they are used by the hundreds unofficially, when as a matter of fact, maybe, not one is so used. Any information would be welcomed by the committee indicating that there are violations of the rule.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will say to the gentleman that I have seen public vehicles frequently used for private purposes. I was wondering whether there was or ought not to be some criminal statute punishing such misuse. The gentleman says that the orders are strict. Who is to give orders to the head of a department or the head of a bureau, and who is going to enforce them? Such orders are a waste of time unless there is some law back of them. Despite the gentleman's obliviousness to the fact, it is quite certain that these public vehicles are frequently used for private purposes.

Mr. FRENCH. That is a general statement without any regard to particular instances. The gentleman seems not to care to point out specific instances.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. What does the gentleman expect?

Mr. FRENCH. The committee would welcome any instances where violation has occurred in the Naval Establishment.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does the gentleman expect a Member of Congress to take the numbers of these cars and then go and find some committee to report it to? If the committee had the authority to correct it, there would be some sense in such a course.

Mr. FRENCH. I should expect when a gentleman makes a statement of that kind that he would be prepared to back it up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho have one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. If I should bring the gentleman a list of half a dozen public automobiles that I have seen in private use, what would he do about it?

Mr. FRENCH. What would I do about it?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. I think the members of the committee would take such action as would be reflected in the appropriations brought before this Congress.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. You would merely reduce the appropriation?

Mr. FRENCH. We would discipline the department, if we had any influence with the Congress.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. How would you do it? The gentleman asks me for specific information, and I ask him what would you do about it if you had the information?

Mr. FRENCH. There are a good many ways to do it. One would be to withhold appropriations for automobiles.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman knows he would not do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Does that mean for me to proceed or for the gentleman from Texas to proceed for his courtesy?

Mr. BLANTON. I should be glad to have the gentleman yield.

Mr. FRENCH. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman any more authority to discipline the department than the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. FRENCH. I did not say "the gentleman from Idaho" would undertake it, if the gentleman will recall my words; I said if this committee had any influence with Congress it would endeavor to do so.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman's committee of five any more authority to discipline a department than has the gentleman from Alabama or his great Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which stands on an equality with almost any committee of the House?

Mr. FRENCH. Again the gentleman backs a little away from his position, but not all the way. I did not say the committee would do it; I said we would discipline the department if we had any influence with the Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. Here is the place to do it—in the forum of this House, where the Members are assembled. This is the duty of the membership, not for the gentleman from Idaho, nor the gentleman from Alabama or the gentleman from Texas, but the Congress ought to administer a rebuke and stop it if it is necessary.

Mr. FRENCH. If the gentleman will cite any cases of that kind the committee and Congress would welcome it. Now, Mr. Chairman, I should be glad to have my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], make a statement to the House. He has made a special study of this matter.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this provision for maintenance and operation of automobiles has been carried at \$175,000 for a great many years last past, with certain limits and restrictions, as it came to our committee. When we came to the hearings we found that a sum was being asked for upkeep and maintenance of cars altogether out of proportion to the mileage covered and the services they performed. I went over the different cars that were there and those that have served so long and run so far that they were unserviceable, and the only way we could find to cut the item down where it ought to be was to require the Navy to get rid of this old junk in the line of automobiles and get new, serviceable machinery.

In order to do that we laid out a program for an increase over what the Budget allowed of 5 cars of the \$1,500 class, 10 at \$500, and to do this we provided for an additional expenditure of \$12,500. As the result of that we are going to be able to reduce the maintenance and operating charges \$75,000.

I believe that this Congress wants to do things right, and wants to put the tools of the Navy Department in condition to use, so that they can use them efficiently and get results and save money for the Government. That is what we have been trying to do. That is what we ask the Congress to help us do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Submarine base, Coco Solo, Canal Zone: For improvements to refrigeration plant, \$36,000; dredging, to continue, \$90,000; in all, \$126,000.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEARS of Florida: Page 39, line 5, insert: "Submarine base extension, \$100,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is going to make the point of order, I wish he would do it. I do not think it is subject to the point of order. I hardly think it is necessary for me to speak upon this question after listening to the able argument of the chairman of the subcommittee in which he just stated we had \$600,000 invested in our Navy stations and submarine bases, and unless we had the tools to work with these were useless. The tools in that case were automobiles. The tools in the amendment which I have just offered is the approach to the submarine base at Key West, Fla. Therefore I believe and I sincerely trust the distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] will not, as able lawyers do, reverse his argument—not reflecting upon him, but hoping that he would still argue for the amendment which I have introduced.

I notice in the report of the committee, Mr. Chairman, that many times appropriations have been placed in the bill by the

committee which have not been estimated for by the Director of the Budget. For instance, there is the naval training station at Hampton Roads, \$260,000. There was no estimate for that made by Director General Lord. I am not complaining because they included the Hampton Roads station in this bill. I have supported every bill I thought was meritorious. The other day I listened to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT], and he convinced me public land offices in certain States should be retained, regardless of the failure of the Bureau of the Budget to estimate for those land offices, and while none in my State was at stake, I voted with those gentlemen, they having convinced me that these land offices should be retained.

The fact of the business is we have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on the submarine base at Key West, Fla., but it is practically useless unless this \$100,000 is appropriated. There is no way to get out to the submarine station. There is no approach to it. I have before me a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Wilbur, dated May 22, 1924, in which he says in the last paragraph:

The department desires very much to have this facility provided at Key West, and it will be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for the consideration of the Congress in the next Budget.

I have before me a letter from General Lord dated May 27, 1924, in which he says:

MY DEAR MR. SEARS: It gives me pleasure to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 24th instant concerning the item of \$100,000 for submarine base extension at the naval station, Key West, Fla., which was included in the Budget for the fiscal year 1925. It is my understanding that the Navy Department contemplates again recommending this item in its estimates for the fiscal year 1926 if it fails of favorable consideration in the appropriation act for the fiscal year 1925, and if this be done I can assure you that I will be very glad, indeed, to give it my consideration at that time.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state—

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Then I shall get recognition in my own right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that; but an attempt was made to withdraw the reservation of the point of order without obtaining recognition.

Mr. BLANTON. It was openly done from the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to secure recognition to do that from the Chair.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does this so that if any other member of the committee should desire to renew the reservation of the point of order the opportunity is afforded. It could not be done in the way the dialogue occurred.

Mr. BLANTON. It has been done now, has it?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas withdraws the reservation of the point of order. The gentleman from Florida will proceed.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for withdrawing the reservation, although, as I stated, I think it is not subject to the point of order. In the hearings, on page 756, for the extension of storage facilities at San Diego, Calif., \$70,000, there was only about one-fourth of page relative to this item, and yet the committee allowed same. I had a talk the other day with General Lord, and I want to be fair with my colleagues, as I have always attempted to be. General Lord this year has not recommended the item for Key West. During the conversation with him he stated he did not recommend it this year because the department failed to convince him that it was meritorious.

I asked General Lord why he recommended it in 1925, when the Secretary of the Navy indorsed it, as did also those who appeared before him, that it was important, and then he did not include it this year. He said it was simply because in 30 or 60 or 90 days the proposition could be completed, and therefore he would put it off to some future date. So it seems that when we get a recommendation from the Bureau of the Budget, as we did in 1925, the Committee on Appropriations leaves it out, and I fear to-day, not having a recommendation from the Bureau of the Budget, that the subcommittee will oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. My colleagues will recall that in the Sixty-fourth Congress I explained the importance of Key West, Fla., from a strategic standpoint. On page 2720, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, you will find these remarks, and in these remarks you will find I stated that Admiral Benson, who is now retired, said that Key West from a strategic standpoint was the most vital and important point in the whole country. Admiral Benson has indorsed it, and my recollection is former Assistant Secretary of the Navy Roosevelt also indorsed Key West as a submarine base.

I also called attention to the importance of Key West as a submarine base on June 25, 1917, pages 4223, 4229, 4230, and 4231, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sixty-fifth Congress, first session; and again on April 10, 1918, pages 4933, 4934, and 4935, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session; and on April 16, 1918, page 5180, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session. In the limited time I have to-day I can not read these remarks in full, but I sincerely trust and ask that each and every one of my colleagues read my remarks in order that they may be fully acquainted with the facts and conditions at Key West and the importance of making this appropriation.

We find ourselves in this position: With a base at Key West completed, or practically completed, but, as stated to me the other day over the phone by one of the leading admirals of the Navy Department, almost useless and practically non-accessible because Congress would not appropriate this \$100,000. So I say it is false economy. Let me call your attention in the few minutes remaining to just the exact conditions, especially those Members who have not heard me discuss this before. Here is Key West, Fla. [demonstrating on map], a submarine base protecting Florida Strait, Yucatan Channel, from which airplanes can be sent up, and if an enemy fleet should be discovered submarines can be sent down to Panama. From Key West, Fla., to Charleston, S. C., a distance of nearly 1,500 miles, is the nearest naval station of all this Atlantic Ocean coast and this part of the Gulf, and in talking with this admiral he told me, as a matter of fact, only minor repairs to submarines could be completed at the naval station at Charleston and that real and complete repairs would have to be made at Hampton Roads, nearly 2,000 miles from Key West, Fla., an exceedingly long distance.

In the Sixty-fifth Congress those of you who served with me will recall I cited an instance in regard to the destruction of a submarine that would have more than paid for this \$100,000. Now, my colleagues, let me say again I want you to read the remarks referred to, because I may make a motion to recommit if the committee should not sustain my motion.

I have told you what admirals thought of it. I told you that Secretary Wilbur indorsed and approved it. I told you that Assistant Secretary of the Navy Roosevelt indorsed it. And another distinguished admiral, whose name I do not desire to give publicly, but I will give it to anyone who asks me, said the other day that the Navy Department must have this \$100,000. Last year, as I stated, General Lord estimated that Congress would not give the appropriation. I have a letter from Senator FLETCHER in which he says, writing to a constituent at Key West, that the Senate committee would not put it in. And so it looks like when we do get the indorsement we lose, and, gentlemen, I am simply appealing to my fair-minded friends on both sides of the House that they vote for this proposition and not defeat it on the grounds of economy.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. During most of the year is it not a fact there are more prominent sojourners from all over the United States, the East especially, in the gentleman's district than he has constituents? The gentleman represents the silk-stocking district of Florida.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I represent the best people in the world. I represent former constituents of yours from practically every district in the United States. I represent people from 16 foreign countries who have come here and become American citizens, but that should not enter into the consideration of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I ask for two minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I regret to ask for this extra extension, but I have not taken up much of your time. I have voted for every proposition since I have been in Congress whether it affected my district or not, which I believed was meritorious, and my colleagues will bear out that assertion. It did not mat-

ter to me whether it was in New York or California. Therefore, even if you do not adopt the Key West, Fla., amendment, I will still defend San Diego, Calif. I have no complaint because it is meritorious. So I ask you, my good friends, those of you who know the situation, to take into consideration the distances I have shown you from Key West, Fla., to Charleston, and from Charleston to Hampton Roads, really from Key West to Hampton Roads, where all repairs to a submarine can be made.

Let me say to you with all sincerity that while this submarine base means much to Florida, it means much more to the entire country, for if another war should come, which I trust will never be the case, this base will not only prevent the landing of an enemy army on the shores of Florida but also is of vital importance in protecting Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama; therefore, indirectly every State in the Union, as it controls the key to the Gulf of Mexico and would prevent the enemy from landing his forces on our southern shores and marching into the interior of our country.

In view of the above, I shall conclude my remarks by stating with a submarine base almost completed at Key West, Fla., lacking only about \$100,000, I sincerely trust the amendment will be adopted, and with that I am willing to leave the proposition with you and let you vote on it.

I regret that the chairman of this committee feels that it is his duty to oppose this proposition, notwithstanding all the recommendations I have called to his attention, and I hope he will not any too vigorously do so, because the support of a submarine base is just as much a tool to protect these wonderful properties of ours as are automobiles. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's hopes that I will not oppose the amendment are as illy founded as any hope that I might entertain that after my statement the gentleman would vote against his own amendment. I did not make the point of order. I reserved it, because I recognize that the amendment is not subject to a point of order.

A year ago the Budget Bureau recommended the continuation of the work at Key West, and it is a work that at some time in the future ought to be cared for. The one thing that appealed to the committee a year ago was that it is a work of a kind that may be cared for in a comparatively short period of time. The work proposed connects the piers in a better way with the shores so as to make the piers more useful.

Now, when it comes to different establishments of this kind it goes without saying that the people of the different communities wish to see them kept in the best possible condition. The commandants of stations are very partial toward the establishments of which they have charge. I remember a year ago when the Navy Department sent out its requests to the different commandants for estimates of the necessary improvements touching the different naval bases and establishments throughout the United States the estimates came back totaling \$63,000,000. These were fairly necessary improvements in the minds of the commandants. The department reduced the estimate to \$4,000,000, thus lopping off \$59,000,000. The Budget reduced the amount to between three and four million dollars.

Now, here is a proposition that came to the committee a year ago. We considered it and concluded that, under the circumstances, we were not justified in carrying out the recommendations that came to us. The Senate committee considered it and refused, as the gentleman says, to act favorably upon the item.

Again the matter comes before Congress, not upon the recommendation of the Budget but upon the motion of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS]. The members of the committee and the Bureau of the Budget have considered this question, as they have the question of further funds for other establishments, and it is our judgment that it is not an improvement of such character that it ought to receive appropriations for continuation now. I hope the amendment offered may be defeated.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. The gentleman said that Members of Congress were anxious to get these appropriations, and therefore to appeal for them. Does the gentleman believe that Secretary Wilbur and Admiral Benson and the former Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Roosevelt, and the former Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Daniels, and other officials of the Navy Department, and General Lord last year recommended it because they were urged by my constituents?

Mr. FRENCH. They realize doubtless that the project has merit. I say it has merit, but I say it does not have such merit as to justify the Congress in making the appropriation at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to call the attention of the gentleman from Florida to the fact that the item to which the amendment is offered relates to the submarine base, Coco Solo, Canal Zone. Is that the intention of the amendment?

Mr. SEARS of Florida. The amendment should say, "After line 5, insert a new paragraph."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida gives no location whatever. Therefore it would relate to the paragraph beginning with line 3.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I ask that the words "Key West, Fla." be placed in there.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEARS of Florida: Page 39, insert after line 5 the following new paragraph:

"Submarine base extension, Key West, Fla., \$100,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is asked for. As many as favor the amendment will rise and stand until they are counted.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 37, noes 45.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. FRENCH and Mr. SEARS of Florida to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 62, noes 51.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I think it must be clear to students of international relations that our present relations with Japan are not fully satisfactory. Great feeling was excited in Japan by the adoption of our immigration law. That feeling has been played upon and fomented by certain Japanese politicians for partisan purposes until public opinion in Japan has been inflamed to a very considerable extent. Japanese public opinion as a whole is highly irritated, and in a time like this it is of the greatest importance that those who assume to speak for America and who desire that our country's peace should be preserved should be circumspect in their actions and in their words. [Applause.] Thoughtful citizens must deplore any attempt upon the part of American public men to play the part in this country which has been played by the Japanese politicians in seeking to obtain political advantage by fomenting this agitated state of Japanese opinion.

In such a situation as the present the decision to hold our naval maneuvers off Hawaii is characterized by the strangest ineptitude and tactlessness. It seems strange indeed that anyone of influence enough to have brought about a decision to hold maneuvers there did not know enough of international affairs to recognize the impropriety of it.

Our purposes toward Japan are friendly and pacific. Nobody in the United States wants war with Japan. All are anxious to remain on the terms of friendliness, confidence, and good will which have characterized our relations with Japan from the very beginning of modern Japanese development. We ought not to be guilty of anything which would give the Japanese just ground to suspect our pacific purposes. Yet in face of that situation we have transferred the major part of our fleet to the Pacific. It has as its base such points as would have been chosen had it been felt that a war with Japan was possible.

The Japanese know what we have done. They are an intelligent people. It is their duty to their own country to know that we have transferred a good part of our fleet to the Pacific side. They are fully advised of the situation. They also know we have no possible antagonist on the Pacific unless it should be themselves—that there is no Pacific power, outside of themselves, that America would give a snap of her finger for. They naturally consider why we have transferred our fleet to the Pacific, and naturally draw the deduction that

we suspect them and their intentions and are preparing against them.

Now, with that situation already in unsatisfactory shape, comes our naval maneuvers to be held off of Hawaii. A play warfare is to be conducted to improve the efficiency of our fleet, a play warfare which will have for its scheme the arrangement of our fleet to defend Hawaii against an imaginary attack.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The Japanese know that these maneuvers are planned and what they will consist of. It is always safe to assume that others have as much sense as we have and that other peoples have as much acumen as our people and as much love for their own institutions as we and as much jealousy of their national rights and as much of a desire to protect them as our Nation has. And the Japanese know that the only imaginary enemy we could possibly have is the Japanese Fleet and that Japan is the imaginary adversary against whom we are defending Hawaii.

Taking into account the agitated condition of public opinion in Japan and the fact that the Japanese Government, no matter how moderate, thoughtful, and pacific its purposes may be, must have a due regard for Japanese public opinion—given that situation, which undoubtedly exists, then we have this Nation, against whom the feelings of Japan have been excited and whom she is being taught to suspect, arranging a mimic warfare with Japan as the imaginary enemy. I ask any man who understands anything whatever of international affairs if that does not consist in itself of an exceedingly tactless maneuver? [Applause.]

Mr. RATHBONE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Not at this time.

Why should we further excite Japanese suspicion and hostility? What is there to be gained by it? There is no good reason. You would think that no sensible man who has at heart the best interests of our country would do such a thing. Yet the Navy Department convicts itself of the stupidity of doing the very thing most calculated to excite suspicion and hostility. I ask gentlemen who are students of history to point to a similar incident in international relations within the last 100 years which is so provocative.

Mr. RATHBONE. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will yield to the gentleman before I get through.

A Member of Congress said here on yesterday that the United States will not recognize the right of any nation to say where we shall hold our naval maneuvers. It is just exactly that jingoistic and bombastic spirit that brings war. [Applause.] It is just that kind of arrogance which causes men to meet upon the battle field in the shedding of men's blood.

Why should we have war with Japan? There is no reason whatever. There is no conflict of interest—neither has anything to gain—both have everything to lose. Are we so stupid that we will go on and on with tactless blundering and further aggravate Japanese opinion until a mine is laid and all it will take is merely a spark thrown by accident into the powder to cause an explosion?

Suppose we sent one of our vessels into Japanese waters, as we did the Maine into Habana Harbor, and it should be blown up. Suppose a tragedy should be caused by mob action or by some fanatic crazed by chauvinism. What would be the result? What would be the result on Japanese public opinion already highly inflamed? I would not like to prophesy.

I realize that our purposes are pacific, as well becomes the dignity and majesty of our country. Our country is too great to be afraid.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Not now.

Our country is too great to fear that it will compromise its dignity by withdrawing from provocative steps which might inflame public opinion in another country. If we were a weak, contemptible nation it might be required that we should take every measure to save our face, but all the nations and peoples of the world know that we are able to take care of ourselves. I say that the proposed Hawaiian maneuvers ought to be called off. If I could control the matter I would call them off.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Excuse me one moment.

The Pacific is wide and there are many places where these maneuvers might be held. There are seven seas to which we can send our Navy for maneuvers, and we can send it wherever we will. That being so, why shall we exhibit the stupidity of sending it to the one particular place that is most dangerous to peace and most tactless just at the present time?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more in order that I may yield to these gentlemen who are so anxious to interrupt me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will take the gentlemen in their turns. First, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RATHBONE].

Mr. RATHBONE. I will ask the gentleman, first of all, if Japan has not recently held naval maneuvers at outposts of their country and if that has been interpreted in this country as any sign of war or a desire for war?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I am not advised that the Japanese fleet has held maneuvers which were in any way objectionable to us.

Mr. RATHBONE. I understand that is the fact.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. But if the Japanese have been guilty of tactlessness that does not warrant us in matching folly with folly. [Applause.] If they have done a wrong thing I would imagine something would have been said about it in this country, but nothing has been said that has come to my knowledge. If they have been guilty of provocation, will we go on and draw a mark and say "Cross that line if you dare." Are we so stupid as that? Surely not. And now I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT].

Mr. RATHBONE. Will the gentleman yield to me for just one more question in order that my attitude may be understood?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I ask, Mr. Chairman, unanimous consent that I may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RATHBONE. If the gentleman will yield, I will state that my attitude is not one of criticism of the Japanese, but merely that we have the right to do the same thing, and I will ask the gentleman one more question.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Just a moment. In reply to that I say that we have the legal, technical right to go just outside of Japanese waters, 3 miles from the shore, and carry on a mimic warfare by which we pretend to bombard Yokohama, but I hope we will not be fools enough to assert all of our legal rights. Now for your other question.

Mr. RATHBONE. Hawaii is the outpost of America, and I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that when under Theodore Roosevelt the American fleet was sent to Pacific waters and the battleships made their tour and visited Japan, instead of stirring up international hostility did it not have an excellent effect, and was not their reception of the finest character everywhere, and were not the relations between the two peoples better afterwards than ever before?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman is a well-informed man, and he knows perfectly well that the situation at present is wholly unlike what it was at the Roosevelt time.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT].

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not possible that some of the legislation which Congress has recently adopted under the inspiration of some of our friends from the Pacific coast has constituted possibly a greater incitement of Japanese resentment against the United States than the holding of any maneuvers on the Pacific coast?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Early in my remarks I explained to the House that the inflamed state of Japanese opinion originated in the passage of our immigration law. I think it was an exceedingly foolish thing, if you will pardon me, gentlemen, for Congress not to have acted on the President's advice. [Applause.] But that is passed.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I will say to the gentleman that that is exactly what I wished to bring out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, out of an abundance of caution I ask that the gentleman may have two minutes, because it may be a long question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McKEOWN. I want to ask the gentleman if he has any information as to whether the State Department was consulted by the Navy Department as to the feasibility of holding these maneuvers and sending the fleet to Australia.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Of course, I could have no information on that subject. Respecting Mr. Hughes as I do, I must assume, however, that had he been called upon he certainly would have given better advice than that which was followed in deciding to hold the maneuvers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. ROMJUE. I ask that the gentleman be granted one minute. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may proceed for one more minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROMJUE. Did I understand the gentleman to say or did the gentleman intend to create the impression that the mere fact that the American Navy may maneuver on the Pacific coast justifies Japan in being suspicious that we might want to go into war with Japan?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It depends entirely on the circumstances and the situation. If, for illustration, in the strained condition which existed between Germany and France immediately before the breaking out of the World War the Germans had mobilized their forces, as they had a perfect right to do, and deployed them on the French frontier, I take it that the gentleman would at once have recognized the impropriety of such action; yet if there had been a state of profound peace and friendship and mutual confidence and good will nothing that either of those nations might have done would have affected international relations. [Applause.]

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wholly agree either with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITEN] or the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON]; but the gentleman from Alabama is right in his discussion of the psychology of peoples and how jingoes can irritate and precipitate a condition that leads to war.

We may not agree with the man in the White House or with the Secretary of State, but I think every man who has a boy and does not want to see him used as cannon fodder, and every man who has due regard for the dignity of nations and the necessity to act with a proper appreciation of the sensibilities of people hopes that all of these gentlemen and all of these newspapers will keep their mouths shut about the Japanese question. [Applause.]

You may not, I say, agree with the man in the White House upon his political theories or with the Secretary of State, but, gentlemen, they are responsible for our foreign affairs. They are men of caution. There is no jingoism about them, and I believe that there is a sincere recognition by the Government of Japan and by the thoughtful people of Japan, just as there is sincere recognition by all thoughtful people in America, that President Coolidge and Secretary Hughes are genuinely friendly to Japan, respect its rights and its sensibilities, and that our foreign affairs can be conducted and will be conducted by them with due regard for all of these psychological factors, and the best thing we Members of Congress can do is to keep our mouths shut about this thing and leave it to the President, who is Commander in Chief of the Navy, and to the Secretary of State, who is the head of our foreign affairs and who has demonstrated his wisdom on this question.

I have always insisted that politics ought to cease at the water's edge. I am with Calvin Coolidge and with Charles E. Hughes in the handling of our foreign affairs, and I have confidence they will uphold not only the rights and the dignity of the people of the United States and of this powerful Nation but they will show the greatest statesmanship of all by recognizing the other man's viewpoint and having due regard for the sensibilities of people and not permit the jingoes of this Nation to drag us into an intolerable position. [Applause.]

There is room on this earth for the development of our great people as there is room on this earth for the development of the Japanese nation. The rights of each can be respected. We can assert our rights as we have done; they can assert theirs. But for God's sake let us leave the handling of our foreign

affairs to men who under the Constitution are charged with that duty until they have shown some disposition to either handle them inefficiently or unwisely. At the present time I think they are handling a delicate situation very diplomatically, and as a Democrat I am proud of the caution and the courtesy, yet firm dignity, and distinctive ability of our great Secretary of State. [Applause.]

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 39, line 5, after the figures \$126,000, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"For continuance of the development of a submarine and destroyer base, Columbia River, Oreg., \$350,000."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. If the gentleman desires, I will reserve it.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish the gentleman would make it.

Mr. FRENCH. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the gentleman making the point of order because of the adoption of the Sears amendment?

Mr. FRENCH. No.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I want it to follow the Sears amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 39, line 5, following the amendment offered by Mr. SEARS of Florida, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"For continuance of the development of a submarine and destroyer base, Columbia River, Oreg., \$350,000."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I think that is not subject to a point of order, and I withdraw it.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, the Congress, on June 4, 1920, appropriated \$250,000 toward the development of a submarine and destroyer base at Astoria, Oreg., near the mouth of the Columbia River. The Columbia River, you will remember, is the second largest river in the United States. It penetrates the great Northwest, and on its banks one-third of the standing timber of this Government grows. That initial appropriation was authorized probably because of several reports by several experts on the matter. I want to read them for the benefit of the House. Admiral Coontz, in his report, No. 1946, part 4, Navy Yards and Naval Stations Commission, fourth report, page 76, Appendix E, Sixty-fourth Congress, has the following to say on this matter:

At Astoria should be placed the best temporary base on the Washington and Oregon coasts.

There was a report made by a committee headed by Rear Admiral Parks. I take the liberty of reading two paragraphs of that report, as follows:

1. The board is in full agreement with the report of the Helm Commission as to necessity for the location of a submarine, destroyer, and aviation base between Puget Sound and San Francisco, and is in further agreement with the commission in its selection of the Tongue Point site at Astoria, Oreg., and the best site both strategically and tactically. The board recommends the site in the locality chosen, but that a larger area, including all the shore front between the railroad and the pierhead line extending from the western point where Tongue Point Peninsula joins the mainland around and including Tongue Point and along the shore line to the mouth of John Day River, is essential.

Acting on that recommendation, the city of Astoria bonded itself, bought the land, and donated over 1,300 acres to the Government for this specific purpose. The board goes on to say:

4. It is recommended that an appropriation of a million and a half be obtained from the present Congress, with authorization for the completion of project not to exceed \$5,000,000, to be completed within three years.

In addition to the foregoing, let me read to you what Brig. Gen. Henry D. Todd, jr., commanding the Ninth Coast Artillery District, which comprises all coast defenses on the Pacific coast, in submitting his report of January, 1924, stated. Among other things, he said:

The coast defenses of the Northwest part of the country would be utterly unable to protect units of the American battle fleet while leaving the harbor and before they could take up battle formation.

Conditions are worse in the coast defenses of the Columbia. There the garrison is so small, 2 Coast Artillery officers and 20 enlisted men for the three forts at the mouth of the Columbia and for the bat-

teries at Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay, that all that can be done is to keep the material in good condition.

Of course, if an enemy determined to make a base near the mouth of the Columbia, he could outrange and overpower the batteries there just as he could at Puget Sound.

Mr. Chairman, for nearly 1,000 miles along the Pacific coast this Government has nothing whatever to defend this Nation from a hostile attack, and the Columbia River is the only point on the Pacific coast where an enemy could penetrate this country for 200 miles on a grade of less than 5 per cent. The enemy could station its men, move its army by water, by rail, or by automobile into the interior for over 200 miles. It could plant its army there, and with the food, such as wheat, vegetables, fruit, dairy products, stock, and everything it needed, could maintain its army with our food and move it to the south by rail or by automobile, and could likewise move it to the north in the same way.

Not only that. If ships from San Francisco or Puget Sound were to encounter an enemy on the Pacific Ocean, became crippled in any way, shape, or form, they would have no refuge of safety nearer than 150 miles one way or 700 miles the other unless we maintain and keep up this base at Astoria.

Now, this base is peculiarly fitted for this service, because it is without the range of the enemy guns. It so happens that it is placed right behind a big mountain of rock that no gun or number of guns from any enemy could ever penetrate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. I ask unanimous consent for two minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATKINS. Think of that mountain overlooking and protecting that wonderful bay! The Navy of the United States could and would be protected while it repaired its boats and received fuel and the like. Not only that, but it would prevent the enemy from invading this country up the Columbia River for more than 200 miles. Since this Government has seen fit to accept the recommendation of every Army officer and Navy officer who examined it, and has gone so far as to take 1,300 acres of land from the city of Astoria for this purpose; since it has seen fit to appropriate \$250,000 several Congresses ago, which amount is about expended, then beyond the peradventure of a doubt this House will be justified in continuing this appropriation in the sum of \$350,000. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to add \$350,000 to the bill in providing for the continuation of work on a submarine base at Tongue Point. This item was proposed by the gentleman a year ago. As a matter of fact, a year ago the Navy Department did not recommend the item to the Bureau of the Budget, nor did the Bureau of the Budget recommend the item to the Congress. The matter was pressed upon the committee at that time, and our conclusion was in line with the thought of the Navy Department and the Bureau of the Budget. Again we find the same situation this year. Neither the Navy Department nor the Bureau of the Budget made any recommendation touching the item to which the gentleman refers. I venture to say that if the Navy Department could have \$350,000 to expend in a permanent establishment for the national defense, it would not be spent at Tongue Point. There would be a good many other places where the money would be expended before the department would undertake the expenditure of money at that place.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. The Government has already expended \$250,000, and where else on the Pacific coast could it establish a submarine base than at the mouth of the Columbia River and let it be out of the range of the enemy's guns?

Mr. FRENCH. I venture to say that if those who have studied this question closely could allocate the money it would be expended probably in Pearl Harbor first, and probably in Puget Sound, before it would be spent at Tongue Point.

There is no urgent demand for further expansion at this time of the submarine base at Tongue Point.

I appeal to the Members of the Congress not to place an item of this magnitude on the bill without any more consideration than can be given to it when a Member offers it from the floor of the House. If that shall be the way in which we legislate, then with just as sound reason we could add millions of dollars to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, the fact that the Budget Committee and the committee of which the gentleman is chairman and the Navy Department have not seen fit to go into and consider this item is a matter for you to take into consideration to this effect: They know nothing about it. I submitted to you the opinion of the experts of the Navy who recommended \$5,000,000. They have gone there and have seen this situation. Let me ask the gentleman this question, and I give him my time in which to reply: What is he going to do with the submarine base already there, established with the \$250,000 which will be expended this year? Is he going to allow it to go to ruin?

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that that institution will be maintained just as other institutions that are not any more active or that are active are maintained at this time. We do not need to maintain all of the naval establishments as though we were in war. We must close down some of them, and that is one I hope that will be closed down this year.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, you are going to close it down?

Mr. FRENCH. Not necessarily; there will be some money expended for maintenance there.

Mr. WATKINS. Where will they get the money with which to maintain it?

Mr. FRENCH. Out of maintenance funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WATKINS) there were—ayes 8, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval station, San Diego, Calif.: For extension of shop and storage facilities, \$70,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUTLER: Page 39, after line 7, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Naval aeronautic station, Pensacola, Fla.: For fuel oil storage, \$35,000."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. Mr. BUTLER. Why, the gentleman's committee asked me to offer this. If you are going to make the point of order, do so, but I am not going to be made a dunce of.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. I reserve the point of order for the purpose of asking whether or not this is an item which came to the committee with the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget and Navy Department?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not care how the report got to the committee, but if the amendment is adopted it is going to save the Government \$32,000 a year, and when the gentleman reserved the point of order I did not know the mysterious purpose he had, and I apologize to the gentleman.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman need not apologize, the committee—

Mr. BUTLER. I am obliged to the gentleman for having made the explanation, and if I may be permitted to say just one word before the committee votes on it. This amendment is for the purpose of putting up an oil tank at Pensacola. Several destroyers are stationed at this point, and there is no opportunity to get oil for the destroyers except from one company known as the Texas Oil Co. That company is charging \$2.10 a barrel. It can be purchased for \$1.38 to \$1.40 a barrel. The authorities say that if they bought the oil from other companies they could save \$32,000 a year, if they have the storage facilities. I do not care to trespass upon our friend in offering legislation, notwithstanding it was submitted to our committee, but in the hearings before our committee in answer to my question the answer was made plain that if we allowed them to put up this tank they can compete and can buy from other companies at \$1.38 to \$1.40 a barrel of oil, and we can save in one year \$32,000, so our committee reported this bill favorably, and I think this is a good opportunity to have it passed if the committee sees fit to pass it.

Mr. FRENCH. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve the point of order just for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Idaho withdraw the reservation of the point of order?

Mr. FRENCH. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve it for just a moment. If the committee had asked anybody but our friend from Pennsylvania to put this legislation on their bill, I would have made a point of order, but I do not believe in the committee using him and then trying to subject him to this kind of treatment, and therefore I will not make it. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw the reservation of the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw it.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, in view of my friend from Pennsylvania misunderstanding my purpose in reserving the point of order, probably I ought to make a short statement. There were several items in the bill which the committee investigated carefully. They came to us in orderly manner from the Bureau of the Budget, but upon further inquiry we recognized we had no jurisdiction and we turned them over to the legislative committee. This was one of them, and I reserved the point of order in order to make inquiry as to whether it belonged to that group. Let me say here I quite concur in the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER]. Providing for oil storage at Pensacola will mean economy to the Government and save a considerable amount annually in the administration of the fuel situation in that part of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

The unobligated balance of the appropriation of \$500,000 contained in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1925 on account of the construction of an extensible building for the supply depot, Marine Corps, San Francisco, Calif., is made available for adding two additional floors to said building, such addition to be of permanent construction and made ready for occupancy in all respects within the amount hereby made available.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of again inviting attention to the inadvisability of using the kind of language that is used in this paragraph. I am opposed to reappropriating the unobligated balance of the appropriation of \$500,000. I think it is much better to allow the money to be covered back into the Treasury, and I think it is much safer to have an estimate of the amount of money that is going to be required for any item than to have that amount of money itself reappropriated rather than to have the unexpended balance reappropriated. It may be explained as to this particular item that you could not say how much the unappropriated balance was as the fiscal year has not yet ended. But while I am discussing this situation generally, permit me to invite your attention to page 48, beginning with line 15, where this language is used:

The Secretary of the Navy may use the unexpended balances on the date of the approval of this act under appropriations heretofore made on account of "increase to the Navy."

Now, I have not critically examined this bill, and I do not know how many times similar language occurs, but I heard the very able and very exhaustive speech by the chairman of the subcommittee who has charge of this bill the other day, and he explained to the Members of the House that this bill carried approximately \$290,000,000. Now, if there are many large unexpended balances carried in the bill, of course, his figures would not be accurate. At the close of the session of Congress the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, or the leader on that side, will get up and make a statement as to the appropriations which have been made. The ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, or the minority leader, will make a similar statement. Their figures will disagree. The people throughout the country or the Members of Congress will be confused over those figures, and it is largely due to the fact that unexpended balances are carried in these appropriation bills. Now, I can readily see, as explained by the chairman of the subcommittee, who has this bill in charge, where material that has been purchased for one year by the Navy Department should be carried over and used for the purpose for which it was purchased, but I believe it is much safer to have all moneys appropriated and unexpended and unobligated covered into the Treasury at the end of each fiscal year and the money reappropriated outright for each item which is carried in any of these appropriation bills.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, broadly speaking, I concur in the observations made by the gentleman who has just taken his seat. The general law provides that building items such as this, or appropriations under building items, shall be continuing appropriations. In this case the money could be expended without further congressional action. The language put in here is for the purpose of limiting the department to that amount on a completed building rather than permitting the amount to be expended on a building which, at the end of the construction, might have but a temporary roof, and the department thus be required to come before Congress for additional money.

A year ago estimates were made for the storage building or depot for the Marine Corps at this point at a cost not to exceed \$500,000. Congress gave the amount, and bids were called for on the basis of a three-story building; the roof, however, to be of temporary construction, with the thought that another couple of stories would be added to the building at a later date. Bids were called for, and it appeared that we could erect the building for \$340,000, considerably below the amount included in the law.

We now find that if we go ahead and use the balance of the money to erect two additional stories and put a permanent roof on the building we can provide accommodations for activities of the Government that are now paying rent in San Francisco amounting nearly to \$20,000 a year. Of that amount, \$7,700 a year is being paid by the Navy, and \$12,000 a year is being paid by other bureaus or branches of the Government. These latter can be housed in the customs office building, where rooms will be vacated by the Naval Establishment if this work can be done. We thought that if with an investment, not to exceed \$160,000, we could save the Government nearly \$20,000 annually in rent, it would be a good business proposition. The proviso in the bill is to limit the department, not to increase its powers, and to prevent a situation from arising requiring more money at a later date.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I think that the committee I sit on authorized the appropriation of this money for one purpose only, and that was to supply a depot for the Marine Corps. Does my friend understand the game that is being played? Does the gentleman know that we always try it on the dog, and the dog is the Marine Corps? Does the gentleman understand that it is proposed to take this building away from the Marine Corps after the Marine Corps obtained this building as a place to deposit its supplies? The Navy being an organization larger than the Marine Corps, it seems the Marine Corps will lose out. Why should not this be placed directly under the Marine Corps?

Mr. FRENCH. We recognize the situation to which the gentleman refers, and we have tried to protect the Marine Corps against it in the report that we made touching the item, where we say:

It is to be understood that the accommodations proposed for the Navy shall not operate to remove the control of the building from the Marine Corps, for which the building was originally authorized and intended.

Mr. BUTLER. That is good and sounds well; but the gentleman knows as well as I know that that has not a particle of restraining influence over the Navy.

Mr. FRENCH. The statute itself provides that it shall be a supply depot of the Marine Corps.

Mr. BUTLER. I know; but I am only echoing the consternation that is in the minds of those people. We supposed it was to be a building where these people can store their supplies. If I had known that it was to be a mixed building, I would not have recommended or favored it. The Navy is asking for a storage place at Alameda for several million dollars. I do not see why we should marry in this building with the Navy.

Mr. FRENCH. The committee that shaped the bill will endeavor in every way possible to cooperate with the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs in protecting the Marine Corps in the management of this building.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I do so, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Idaho a question. What was

the total amount of the appropriation that was passed for the purpose of constructing this Marine Corps warehouse?

Mr. FRENCH. Five hundred thousand dollars a year ago. This provides that the balance in excess of \$340,000 already obligated may be expended in erecting two additional stories and putting a permanent roof on the building.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Was that \$500,000 expended for the construction of the building that is there now?

Mr. FRENCH. The building is in process of construction, on the basis of three stories and a temporary roof. We will save the cost of the temporary roof and make use of the walls that are being erected, and make use of the contractor's plant that he has put there for use in the construction of the building if we add the other two stories now. Generally speaking, it will be the economical thing to do to go ahead and carry the building up to five stories with a permanent roof, instead of only three stories with a temporary roof, expecting additional stories later on.

Mr. McCLINTIC. My recollection is that this was to take care of the needs of the marines.

Mr. FRENCH. That is right.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Now you ask for an additional \$500,000 to be added, making this building cost, as I understand, when erected, \$1,000,000?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, no. The two additional stories may now be added within the total appropriation of a year ago if they are added before the temporary roof is put on.

Mr. BUTLER. Three hundred and forty thousand dollars?

Mr. FRENCH. A total of \$500,000, of which \$340,000 has been obligated, leaving a balance of \$160,000.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Is this an extension of the appropriation in the last bill?

Mr. FRENCH. It is a continuing appropriation on which we are proposing the restriction indicated.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS
AVIATION, NAVY

For aviation, as follows: For navigational, photographic, aerological, radio, and miscellaneous equipment, including repairs thereto, for use with aircraft built or building on June 30, 1925, \$375,000; for maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft factory, helium plant, air stations, fleet activities, testing laboratories, and for overhauling of planes, \$6,921,625, including \$300,000 for the equipment of vessels with catapults; for continuing experiments and development work on all types of aircraft, \$1,550,000; for drafting, clerical, inspection, and messenger service, \$700,000; for new construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment, \$5,243,375; in all, \$14,790,000; and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Aviation" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing laws as "Aviation" and for that purpose shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated and specified for expenditure for new construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment the Secretary of the Navy may enter into contracts for the production and purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts, and accessories, to an amount not in excess of \$4,100,000: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for maintenance of more than six heavier-than-air stations on the coasts of the continental United States: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the construction of a factory for the manufacture of airplanes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay out of this appropriation the amounts due on claims for damages which have occurred or may occur to private property growing out of the operations of naval aircraft, where such claim does not exceed the sum of \$250: *Provided further*, That all claims adjusted under this authority during the fiscal year shall be reported in detail to the Congress by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I want to ask the gentleman from Idaho a question as to the item on page 40. I would like to know the significance of this clause—

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the construction of a factory for the manufacture of airplanes.

Was it proposed by the department to establish a factory?

Mr. FRENCH. The factory for the manufacture of airplanes at Philadelphia was built several years ago without the specific authority, as I understand it, of the Congress. It was resented by the Congress at the time, and this language has been carried here for several years.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does it mean that the committee is opposed to the Government building its plants?

Mr. FRENCH. If we were to build a plant it would require, as we see it, general legislation.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The department has no authority to build a plant unless it is authorized to do so by some legislation?

Mr. FRENCH. No.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Then why put that language in the bill? It is not necessary, is it? It looks to me as though it were an attempt on the part of somebody to tie up the Government to the policy of being required to buy these airplanes from private concerns.

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, no. I think the gentleman is right in saying that the department would not have authority to go ahead and erect an airplane factory without authorization. This apparently was written into the law as an additional precaution, and it has been carried for several years. I do not believe the language is needed. The gentleman himself does not want the department to go ahead and erect an aircraft manufacturing plant without authority from Congress?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. No; but I would not want to commit the Government irrevocably to this kind of a policy.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. Has there been any effort on the part of the committee to coordinate this department with the air service of other departments of the Government?

Mr. FRENCH. In just what way does the gentleman use the word "coordinate"? Does the gentleman mean to amalgamate them as one service?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. The members of the committee, of course, would not have authority to do that, but I beg to say that we have gone into the question of the extent to which they are coordinating, each within the services or duties imposed upon the respective units; that is, the Army air unit and the Navy air unit. As much as possible we are trying to be helpful in seeing that they coordinate so there will not be an overlapping of activities. For instance, not long ago planes acquired by the Navy Department for the use of the Navy of one type were of a type so similar or identical to the type of the Army that it was arranged that the requirements of each should be contracted for simultaneously, in that way saving the Government many thousands of dollars. So wherever we can bring about coordination we are doing so.

The Navy Department wishes to do so and the War Department wishes to do so. On the other hand, my personal opinion is, regardless of the fact that we do not have authority to bring in any program of amalgamation, so as to constitute a separate air service for the United States, as they now have in Great Britain, France, and Italy, that it would be an unwise thing to do. I am more and more led to that conclusion as I study the benefits of the competitive system which exists here. More than that, I am led to that conclusion from studying the effect of the separate competitive system we have here, and measuring the results for the Navy and comparing those results with the results obtained in Great Britain, France, and elsewhere. I believe that from the standpoint of design, effectiveness and the science of aviation the United States leads them all. We do not lead in numbers, but from the standpoint of the Navy I think the art within our country has attained a greater height than it has in other countries, and I think the main reason is because we have a separate institution that realizes the importance of the air service to the Navy as a part of the Naval Establishment, and because of that it has been able to bring about results that are desirable. May I say further that Great Britain at this time, in my judgment, is on the point of establishing a separate naval air service. I understand this to be part of the program of Premier Baldwin, who has recently become the head of the British Government.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I wish to say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL]—as the gentleman from Idaho well knows—that there is a strong coordinating arrangement between the Army and Navy air forces.

Mr. FRENCH. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I ask the gentleman from Idaho a question?

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to retain the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes longer. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWELL. The reason I am making the inquiry is because of a controversy over this question which I heard a

short time ago in which it was charged, with a good deal of force, that a great many millions of dollars was being spent by the Government annually in duplications of this work in the various departments, and that if the departments could be placed under one organization many millions of dollars could be saved, and, perhaps, greater results obtained. What does the gentleman say with reference to that in the way of an economical conduct of the department?

Mr. FRENCH. Well, I do not think you could obtain the results we are now obtaining by any such program. I do not think there is duplication to a great extent. We have a joint board that has to do with aeronautics, representing the War Department and the Navy Department. That board endeavors to work out a program so that there will be as little as possible of overlapping of activities. But the gentleman must realize this:

Suppose that you would draw a hard and fast line to separate the Army and Navy activities, say, along the coast. That would, of course, have to be an exact line where the land and ocean meet or else a few miles out at sea or a few miles inland. Where would you draw the line? Would it be up to an Army officer in the event of crisis when he reached the line to turn back from an enemy plane and let a naval officer take charge? Such supposition is absurd. The best we can do, as I see it, is to define the Army and Navy work along broad lines and then mix with administration a good deal of sound sense and respect for the other service.

Mr. DOWELL. That is the identical question I was trying to bring out.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having taken the chair, a message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions and bill:

S. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution extending appropriation in connection with Columbia Basin investigation;

S. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution providing for the control and eradication of the European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry; and

S. 3545. An act to revise and reenact the act entitled "An act granting consent of Congress to the Huntington & Ohio Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a highway and street-railway bridge across the Ohio River between the city of Huntington, W. Va., and a point opposite in the State of Ohio," approved August 18, 1923.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: Page 40, line 2, after the word "planes," strike out the figures "\$6,921,625" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$11,921,625: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000,000 may be used for the acquisition of land or interest in land by purchase, lease, or condemnation, where necessary, to explore for, procure, or reserve helium gas, and also for the purchase, manufacture, construction, maintenance, and operation of plants for the production thereof and experimentation therewith."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order upon the amendment.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. FRENCH. I will be pleased to reserve the point of order.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that this is the identical language that was carried in last year's military appropriation bill except as to the amount.

This is to cover a matter recommended by the helium board, composed of representatives of the Bureau of Mines, and recommended also by those in the Army and those in the Navy who have advocated the conservation of helium.

About three years ago extensive hearings were had before the Committee on Public Lands looking to the development and conservation of helium. After rather extensive hearings that committee decided it did not have jurisdiction. All of those who appeared and all of those who were interested in helium, including Doctor Moore, who has spent years in this work, were very earnest in their desire that this matter be taken care of. The matter then went to the Committee on Military Affairs, and after some considerable hearings at the last session they reported a bill covering the project. There does not seem to be any opposition to it on the part of those who have investigated

it. This bill is pending before the House, but of course, even if it passed at this session, it would be impossible to take care of it in the way of an appropriation unless some appropriation of this character had been made.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JONES. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. McKEOWN. I simply wanted to ask the gentleman if the adoption of his amendment would not tend to decrease the production of helium rather than increase it, because you take it away from private individuals.

Mr. JONES. I do not think so at all. As a matter of fact, this is an appropriation that would care for a product that is in this country and is in no other country in appreciable quantities. A number of other countries have spent more than is proposed to be spent here in an effort to discover helium or to discover a process of making helium, realizing its great value. Here we have the natural product on which we have a monopoly and which we are allowing to go to waste in the gradual use of the natural gas of this country.

I assume a good many of you heard the speech made by my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] on yesterday. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] is the helium expert of the House and appeared before both of these committees and urged the adoption of this bill.

Now, listen. Everyone who has studied the efforts of the last war realizes that the next war is going to be fought in the air and under the sea, probably, if we are ever so unfortunate as to get into another war. In accordance with the disarmament conference we have sunk battleships worth a great deal more than is suggested here. So far as the House is concerned, we authorized at the close of the last Congress the building of cruisers to the extent of more than \$100,000,000 and certain other ships for war purposes. There are large appropriations in this bill for the same purpose. If my amendment is adopted, I will move to reduce the appropriation for ships, so that it will not increase the appropriation as carried in the bill. I believe that this is more important probably, in so far as any prospective war is concerned, than the building of all those ships. It is something that this country has a natural monopoly of. Would it not be wise to transfer a portion of the funds herein appropriated to this new and valuable use?

In the last war we had captive balloons at various places on the front. We used various methods of getting views of the opposition's positions by means of hydrogen-filled balloons. A single incendiary bullet would destroy the whole thing, and yet we found it advisable to use them. Helium will not explode. It will not burn. You can shoot an incendiary bullet through a balloon filled with helium and it will not explode. This has been thoroughly tested. By means of a process now used a small opening in the balloon will heal itself, so that a bullet might pass through a helium filled balloon without doing material damage.

Here is an element on which the United States Government has a natural monopoly. It is found in commercial quantities in no other country on the globe. They have tried to buy some from this country. They have tried to discover it, but they have been unable to do so.

You know it is strangely true that a great deal of the development of the natural resources of a community or of a town or of a national government even is made by people from the outside. We frequently do not appreciate what is nearest us. There are a great many little cities that are developed in that way. A Columbus has to come along sometimes and discover the fine things. It is usually in the form of some one from the outside who sees the possibilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JONES. Other countries realize the importance of this product, and I believe this country ought to do so. Doctor Moore and the entire helium board for three years have urged this measure and have advocated it in every possible way. Those in the Navy who have had charge of this proposition have appeared before both the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee and have secured appropriations from year to year barely sufficient to run the little plant located in one part of the United States, and yet we have helium in a number of places strung out from Texas all the way up to Pennsylvania, and it is in commercial quantities at a number of those places.

It is a new project. We spend a great deal more than this in the development of things not half so important. I hope

the chairman of the committee will not urge his point of order. It is in the exact language of the last military appropriation bill. The matter has been thoroughly considered by the Public Lands Committee and they were all favorable, but held that they did not have jurisdiction. It went before the Committee on Military Affairs and they reported the bill.

During the World War a great many shots were wasted, because it was impossible to tell the exact location of the mark at which the same were leveled. Perhaps a very small percentage of the shots that were actually fired reached the ultimate mark at which they were aimed. In an effort to aid in finding the exact location of the enemy and the point sought to be reached, captive balloons were used for observation. These captive balloons were filled with hydrogen. They would remain up for hours with observers surveying the enemy's camps, fortifications, and locations. A single shot would destroy them and endanger the lives of the observers, yet it was necessary to use them. If they had been filled with helium, they would have been very much safer.

Most of the raids over London were conducted by the Germans in dirigibles, because they could carry immense supplies of bombs. These dirigibles were filled with hydrogen, which is very combustible. Had they been filled with helium they would have been much safer, longer trips could have been made, and the damage very greatly increased.

Helium is being wasted in this country whenever a cubic foot of gas is used that contains helium, and when gone it is gone forever. There is no assurance that the supply is unlimited. Nothing has been found to take its place. It would seem, therefore, that the wise policy would dictate its conservation, and I hope the amendment will be agreed to. It would simply mean a transfer of a portion of the funds carried in this bill from the building of cruisers and battleships to the conservation of helium. The battleship is becoming of less and less importance in war time. The overhead warfare and undersea warfare is becoming more important. The adoption of this amendment under the circumstances would mean no greater expenditure, and yet I think a much wiser one.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of making a statement with reference to helium. I am a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, and as a member I have taken a good deal of interest in the development of aircraft. I hold somewhat different views from a majority of the members of the committee in that I believe with my colleague from Texas that in the future a majority of our conflicts will be decided in the air or under the water.

Not long ago there was given publicity in this country to a statement which was to the effect that in a short time it was proposed to build a large dirigible which would be twice as large as the *Shenandoah*, and if there is to be development of this kind, then it is going to be necessary, if we are to proceed along those lines to make proper investigation for the purpose of finding out whether we have a sufficient amount of the kind of gas that will make navigation safe in the air.

In the State of Oklahoma we have extensive gas fields, and in nearly all of the gas fields that I have been informed about there is to be found a large amount of helium. Most of the helium at the present time is going to waste. If we are to develop our aircraft in the future in either branch of the Army or the Navy, surely it would be economy in the end to appropriate a little money to be used for this purpose.

When it is taken into consideration that this amendment only increases the appropriation \$2,000,000, and when we compare it with appropriations for other branches of the Navy, it seems to me it would be wise to favor this amendment so that we can make proper investigation along the lines that will give us the information necessary to make navigation of the air more safe. Inasmuch as other countries do not have the advantage of helium, and helium is to be found in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, surely it would be economy in the end to allow an amendment of this kind to be considered in order that we may progress in the future along the line of absolute necessity. Therefore, I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will see the necessity of aiding in this movement rather than throwing something in the way by making a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a short statement on this subject. If there is a Member of Congress that did not hear the speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] on helium yesterday, he ought to read it. It is illuminating; it is a splendid discussion of the development of helium and the importance of helium to our country.

We are making tremendous progress. For instance, from the standpoint of production and the cost of production, a year ago

when a representative of the department came before our committee it was the understanding that at that time, or at least immediately before that time, it cost as high as from \$100 to \$135 a thousand cubic feet to extract helium. At that time we were advised of a process by which it was hoped the cost could be brought down; it was hoped that it could be reduced as low as \$15 a thousand cubic feet. This year when the officers came before our committee we were told that already through a new process they have reduced the cost of recovering helium from natural gas to about \$55 per thousand cubic feet, practically cutting it in two.

We are developing along other lines. For instance, the question of storage has been a difficult proposition. How are you going to care for helium and store it after it is extracted from the natural gas? There are different methods of storing helium, but all are expensive, and I believe the cheapest method adds about 30 per cent to the cost of the helium. In other words, it costs that much to store it, in addition to the cost of recovering the helium.

We are developing a means by which it can be stored underground. We need to develop and explore along that line. In other words, if we are going to use the gas that contains helium, we have to prepare some sort of storage capacity until it may be used.

On the other hand, the members of this committee realize that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Appropriations Committee shall not permit to go upon their bills large programs that are legislative programs rather than appropriation programs. Here you are asking an appropriation of \$5,000,000. I do not doubt that it is for a good purpose. I wish there were some way now by which we could conserve the helium. It may be even that this would be in line of economy in the long run, but there is something more important than permitting an item to go into this bill now, and that is the integrity of the rules of the House touching great policies that ought to be cared for by the legislative committees. For that reason I am constrained to make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Is there a way of keeping the gas after it is put in the envelope? Does it escape from the envelope readily?

Mr. FRENCH. We have gone into that. There is some loss, but not nearly so much as with hydrogen. Even so when the gas is in the bags used in our ships there is a certain loss.

Mr. TILSON. Is there any deterioration in quality when it is stored even under ground?

Mr. FRENCH. Practically none, and I would say that even if there were deterioration, we have developed processes of purifying the helium so that it can be restored to its original purity, either from storage or gas bags.

Mr. TILSON. Did I understand the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] correctly the other day in saying that this method of using water ballast had succeeded to such an extent that it is not necessary to valve out any helium in order to prevent rising?

Mr. FRENCH. That is correct. The gases that escape from the exhaust of the motors will, when combined with other elements of the air be converted into water that will weigh even more than the weight of fuel oil originally. In other words, it will amount practically to 110 per cent of the weight of the original fuel oil, so that there even would be water to throw away.

Mr. TILSON. So that there is no loss of gas practically by valving?

Mr. FRENCH. No; providing we have this device attached to the ship.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman realizes that the helium that is in the gas when the gas is used up is wasted?

Mr. FRENCH. Absolutely.

Mr. JONES. And there is no assurance of our permanent supply of helium?

Mr. FRENCH. That is correct.

Mr. JONES. And this is about the only way for doing this at this short session.

Mr. FRENCH. I am sorry to be compelled to make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds that this language was used in the Army appropriation bill a year ago, but no point of order was raised against the language at that time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I concede that it is subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas concedes the amendment to be subject to the point of order. The Chair is distinctly of the opinion that it is subject to the point of order and sustains the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last line for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] a question. It is easy enough to theorize about grouping or coordinating Government activities, but it is very difficult sometimes to do anything of that sort, even though the theory itself may seem to be perfect. The joint committee on the reorganization of the Government departments did not consider it wise or expedient to report any proposition of that sort to the House with reference to the various air services. This is the question I desire to put to the gentleman from Idaho: Whether from his very intimate knowledge of the work of the Committee on Appropriations he can give us any idea of what the total expenditures are for the air service in its various aspects during the present fiscal year?

Mr. FRENCH. Approximately \$65,000,000, if you include the pay and subsistence of the men. If the gentleman refers merely to the appropriations carried for the air establishments, not including the men and their subsistence, he would have about half that amount, or somewhere near \$30,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Is the gentleman taking into consideration all of the air services?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. In the different departments of the Government? The gentleman is not confining his statement simply to the Army and the Navy?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, no. I am including the different aviation activities of the Government.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman stated that his committee did not find that these departments of the air should be united. Upon what theory did the committee arrive at that conclusion?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. It was upon representations similar to those that have been stated by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] that the activities are so diverse that they can not well be grouped so as to maintain the efficiency that we all desire. I will say this to the gentleman, that perhaps he and I might agree that it would be well to have a standing committee which could take into view all of the needs of the Government in respect to air service, a committee on which members of the Committee on Naval Affairs and members of the Committee on Military Affairs might serve.

Mr. DOWELL. We have that system somewhat followed in the fact that all members of the Committee on Appropriations are members of subcommittees.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That is true as to appropriations, but I am talking about the legislative features that have to be dealt with.

Mr. DOWELL. As I understand, the gentleman's committee has as its purpose the coordinating of the various departments of the Government for the purpose of economy and efficiency. Does the gentleman believe that our system of each department now having an entirely separate department of the air will do the work with the same economy and the same efficiency as if all of the appropriations for the air were put into the hands of one single department, with such branches as might seem advisable after the work has progressed to a certain point? Would not better results follow from such an organization?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I would have been prepared two years ago to answer that question in the affirmative, but after hearing the evidence presented to our committee I was obliged to come to a different conclusion.

Mr. DOWELL. Then, in other words, the gentleman believes there is more efficiency in the present departments than there would be if they were united into one division?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. If I had not thought so, I would, as one member of the committee on reorganization, have advocated a grouping of the various services. The committee, however, is of opinion, as unanimously expressed in its report, which excludes any suggestion of the coordination of these various services, that it can not wisely be done at this time.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Does the chairman of the committee think that lighter-than-air machines have any practical use in actual war; and if so, what would that use be?

Mr. FRENCH. Well, the members of the committee asked that very question of those representing the aviation service, and it is the belief of officers that the lighter-than-air craft does have a military value. Were an inflammable gas used, the value of the lighter-than-air craft would not commend itself. Even so, it was used considerably during the World War. The fact that we have helium gives advantage in that regard to the United States. Of course, I do not believe its value equals the heavier-than-air craft as part of our defense.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. As a matter of fact if we had a fleet of the lighter than air such as the one that was christened here the other day, the *Los Angeles*, filled with helium and war should be declared we would spend a little money, would we not, finding a cave to hide it in where they could not find it with an airplane?

Mr. FRENCH. I recognize there is force in the suggestion the gentleman makes, that as a fighting weapon it does not have in my judgment the value of the heavier-than-air craft.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. But the objection in the last war to these machines was that we did not have helium gas and an inflammable bullet would set one on fire by combustion or breaking. Now the advantage of these machines we have here is they not only have helium, but it is kept in separate bags so that in case one or a dozen go the machine can still fight effectively. The whole condition has changed since the last war.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I ask the gentleman, who has studied the proposition, what was he going to do with it in case of a war.

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. I am not going to do anything with it, I trust that matter to the Secretary of War and to the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I have asked that same question of the War Department and the Navy Department, and no one has ever been able to answer the question. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed, I want to say, to the development of the art if we want to spend a lot of money on it, but I am opposed to the idea of holding it up as a fighting asset. It has no value. If anyone had been down to the christening of the *Los Angeles*, he would have observed that it took them nearly three hours and 500 men finally to bring that machine to the ground. One airplane could have destroyed a hundred of them. They have no defense. I just wanted to call the attention of the House to that fact.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I am perfectly willing, as far as I am concerned, to develop helium gas. It may have some commercial purpose; I do not know but what it has, but it is not proper when you are appropriating for the Army and Navy, and it is very questionable whether you have the right to appropriate to develop an industry for commercial purposes, and that is what you are doing so far as lighter-than-air machines go to-day.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. Of course, probably the reason they took so much time to come down was their desire not to waste any of the helium, but on the question of use in war the gentleman realizes that we used captive balloons in great quantities during the war which were filled with hydrogen—

Mr. HULL of Iowa. And all of questionable value.

Mr. JONES. They used them all through the war, even up to the close of the war. Of course, the gentleman might want us to take his word and judgment against the word and judgment of those who were in control of the military and naval forces during the war. The Germans made a number of raids of a wide radius with lighter-than-air craft which were combustible.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. But the development of the airplane to the present high state of the art makes the lighter-than-air machines absolutely obsolete.

Mr. JONES. We had airplanes during the war, and these machines can go a much greater distance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired, and the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL ACADEMY

Pay, Naval Academy: Pay of professors and others, Naval Academy: Pay of professors and instructors, including one professor as librarian, \$236,900: *Provided*, That not more than \$36,500 shall be paid for masters and instructors in swordsmanship and physical training.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to call attention during these five minutes to

the subject of the Naval Academy. This week the newspapers carried a report that a new superintendent had been selected or appointed for the Naval Academy. I have called up the Bureau of Navigation and find that report is true, and Admiral Wilson is to be retired some time during February and is to be succeeded at the academy by Admiral Nulton, I believe. Admiral Wilson has been in charge of the academy some three or four years, and his superintendency of the institution has certainly been most unfortunate for the academy. All those who are interested in the academy, I feel sure, will welcome the news that he is to be retired as superintendent and a new man placed at the head of that institution. In the first year of his superintendency of the academy he came before the committee and recommended in just a few words the dismissal of 79 civilian professors and their replacement by naval officers, all of whom, of course, are inexperienced as educators or instructors. The committee, of course, did not accept that recommendation, but we had to put in the bill a limitation or provision which would prevent the superintendent from removing the civilian professors and substituting naval officers in their place. Now we have put that limitation or provision in each appropriation bill that has been passed since Admiral Wilson was assigned to that institution.

Now, I have observed that the committee has not seen fit to put that provision in the pending bill. I have not read the hearings, and I do not know what it is that justifies the committee in the view they are now taking. I hope they have a sufficient reason for not carrying that provision in the bill. I am not going to make any effort this year, as I have done each year for several years past, with the assistance of many other Members, to put that provision back in the bill, because my observation has been that it makes no difference if we do put it in; it will be disregarded.

We have put that provision in each year in the last four years, I believe, to prevent the superintendent from discharging the civilian professors. He has taken advantage of technicalities and evaded the express direction of Congress concerning civilian professors, and the morale of the institution and the standards of teaching have deteriorated as the result of this course of action.

I hope the Naval Affairs Committee will take under consideration legislation governing the Naval Academy. There ought to be legislation on this subject of the management of that institution if we are to preserve it as a great educational institution, such as it was intended to be. As it is now, there is practically no law governing it, and each superintendent when appointed can generally do about as he pleases, because the Secretary of the Navy generally follows the recommendations of the superintendent.

There is a provision of law for the appointment of a Board of Visitors at the academy once each year. The Board of Visitors is composed of a certain number of Senators appointed by the President of the Senate and a certain number of Members of the House appointed by the Speaker and certain others appointed by the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes additional?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DENISON. In a moment.

The Board of Visitors go to the academy once a year and make some observations and study of how it is being conducted, and make a report. Now, these Boards of Visitors for a number of years have been composed of very able men, including prominent educators of the country, and they have repeatedly made specific recommendations as to what should be done to secure able men in the faculty, able civilian professors in the faculty, and as to how the institution should be run along that line; the Secretary of the Navy has attempted to put the recommendations of the board into effect with reference, for instance, to the pay of civilian professors and as to promotions and other regulations of that kind. But Admiral Wilson swept that all aside and has been running the institution in a very arbitrary and unsatisfactory manner.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. This academy has the standing of a first-class university. With respect to all other universities, no president of a university can discharge any member of the faculty until he has submitted his recommendation to a board of regents to pass upon the matter. What kind of a board

of regents have we for the Naval Academy to pass upon recommendations made by Admiral Wilson, the presiding superintendent?

Mr. DENISON. Well, they have had an academic board composed of the heads of each of the departments. There are various departments, you know—English, history, and so on—and the heads of these departments comprise the academic board that is supposed to advise with the superintendent as to the policy of the institution. The superintendent is supposed to consult this board with reference to the management of the institution. Admiral Wilson has not consulted them with reference to the civilian instructors and professors. He has shown a contempt for their views, and he has run that institution, as I have taken occasion heretofore to say, as he would run a battleship.

Mr. BLANTON. Can he dismiss faculty members without the consent of this board?

Mr. DENISON. He has been doing it. I have called the attention of the House to the matter year after year, and we have been trying to cure that situation and prevent its continuance. But, in spite of all that Congress could do by these limitations on appropriation bills, the superintendent has dismissed some of the best men they had on the civilian faculty, arbitrarily and contrary to expressed wishes of Congress.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Does the gentleman realize that Congress can not specify who is to be employed and who shall not be employed in that institution and that we must depend upon the head of the institution? If we can not, we should have some one in whom we would have confidence to run the institution properly. In other words, the Congress can not take up the question of each individual professor in the institution to determine what status he should have in the institution.

Mr. DENISON. Of course the gentleman is correct, and Congress has never attempted to do so, and I have never advanced the theory that we ought to do so. But I do not think the superintendent should have the power to run the institution just as he wishes, because that is not in harmony with the plan under which it is supposed the institution is to be conducted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. DENISON. May I have two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Can the gentleman tell us what proportion of the professors are civilians?

Mr. DENISON. I do not know now.

Mr. BRIGGS. What has it been heretofore?

Mr. DENISON. It has varied from year to year. About four years ago it was in the proportion of 50-50.

Mr. FRENCH. There were 69 civilian instructors this year and 143 naval instructors. The estimate this year for next year is 66 civilians and 138 naval instructors.

Mr. BRIGGS. What relationship obtains at West Point as between civilian instructors and Army instructors?

Mr. FRENCH. At West Point there are very few civilian instructors.

Mr. BRIGGS. How does it happen that so many civilian instructors have been employed heretofore at the Naval Academy in preference to naval instructors or officers of the Navy?

Mr. FRENCH. I do not like to intrude on the gentleman from Illinois, but I would say that the great increase occurred during the war, when officers were needed in the service.

Mr. DENISON. I hope the chairman of the subcommittee can in a moment give the House some good and sufficient reason for leaving out of the pending bill the limitations the House has put in the bills for the last four years in order to protect the institution; and I also hope the chairman of the subcommittee can give a satisfactory and sufficient explanation of the reason for the large decrease in the appropriation. The bill last year carried \$275,000 and the amount has been reduced to \$236,900 in this bill; the year before it was \$325,000, and the year before that it was \$421,000. So there has been a substantial annual decrease in the appropriations for the academy during these last four years, and there is a very substantial decrease in the appropriation for this year. Unless the plan is to further reduce the number of civilian professors, I can not understand why there is this great reduction in the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, with regard to numbers of civilian members of the faculty at Annapolis, I beg to say that the first great reduction was made from 1922 to 1923, when we reduced from 135 to 97. That was occasioned by the plan of administration of the academy to get back to what was regarded as a better division of civilian and official faculty members of the faculty. For 1924 we appropriated for 92 civilians. I think the reduction of 5 that year was administrative. The next year, 1925, when we provided for 69 civilian members of the faculty, the reduction was congressional. In other words, we ourselves gave an appropriation that required a reduction. The other reason—in addition to the first reduction looking to getting back to what the Navy Department regarded as a better balance of civilian and officer members of the faculty—was because of the decrease in the number of midshipmen at the academy. In 1923 we had 2,395, and in 1924, 2,499 midshipmen. Then, as the gentleman will recall, the policy of permitting Members of Congress to name five midshipmen each entered into the situation and a reduction was made in the number of midshipmen that could be named, so that from that time on the Members of Congress could name three. Naturally, the falling off in enrollment at the academy would not take effect completely the first year. The entering class would be only three-fifths of the graduating class, assuming that all graduated, but the three higher classes would still be the same. In other words, it would take four years for those who had been appointed when Members of Congress could appoint five midshipmen to pass out of the institution.

Now, that is responsible for the reduction in the number of faculty members for the current year. We have now 1,976 midshipmen as against nearly 2,500 in 1924, and for the coming year we estimate the number to be 1,600.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I wish the gentleman's committee had taken off these other 66 civilian professors and put officers in their stead, because we are getting so many naval officers that we might just as well make some use of them. We have not any other use for a lot of them unless we put them to teaching. We have trained them and we might as well get the benefit of their knowledge.

Mr. FRENCH. The Navy Department believes that for certain branches civilian members of the faculty can more advantageously be employed. That is not to say that an officer member of the faculty, if he were to make for his life career a specialty of teaching some subject, like English or possibly history or some other subject, would not succeed as well as though he were a civilian. On the other hand, the department believes there are certain branches that can be better taught by civilians, who will continue on from year to year. Personally I think so.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. What amount of this appropriation is utilized for the payment of the salaries of civilian instructors?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, all of this item is used for that purpose. The officers' salaries are borne out of pay of the Navy.

Mr. BRIGGS. In that connection I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee another question. I saw in the papers recently a statement to the effect that there was a shortage of naval officers. Has the committee made any investigation of that subject?

Mr. FRENCH. A shortage of naval officers?

Mr. BRIGGS. Yes; for sea duty and manning ships. Is that true? I saw that in a newspaper report recently.

Mr. FRENCH. Here is the situation: The general law provides—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Before the gentleman from Idaho begins let me say this to the gentleman from Texas: That those of us who have been here for 25 years or more know that there is always a shortage of officers, especially at this season of the year.

Mr. BRIGGS. I thank the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee for that information.

Mr. FRENCH. Under the general law we may have an enlisted personnel of 137,485, and under the law 4 per cent

would be the officer complement; in other words, we would be entitled to 5,499 line officers on the basis of 137,485 enlisted men. As a matter of fact, we have 86,000 enlisted men now, and 4 per cent of 86,000 would be somewhere under 3,600. Instead of having 3,600 officers of the line we have 4,732 officers, as of September 30, 1924.

Mr. BLANTON. Then we have a surplus of 1,100?

Mr. FRENCH. Just a moment, and I think the gentleman will feel the situation is probably being maintained correctly. In other words, if you measure the officer strength by the possible officer strength on authorized enlisted personnel, we have an under number. If you measure it by the actual enlisted personnel, we have an excess of 1,100, as the gentleman from Texas suggests.

We realize it takes years to train an officer. It takes as many years to train an officer as it takes months to train an enlisted man to perform efficient duty. We believe it is the part of wisdom, and I think the House believes it is the part of wisdom, to maintain rather a larger officer personnel, taking it for granted that in the event of an emergency we can train the enlisted personnel to make good in large degree, as they have done in the past. So the gentleman who received his advice may have been rightly advised from one point of view but wrongly advised from another.

Mr. LOWREY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. May I first finish the question that the gentleman from Illinois asked before we get too far away from his question? The gentleman wants to know why we left out the language in the bill which we reported touching a sort of protection to civilian members of the faculty at Annapolis. In the first place, when the reduction came to be made at the academy of civilian teachers some three years ago there were two thoughts in view. I think that the administration of the academy, and probably the department, felt we ought to maintain more officers than we were maintaining at that time. Again, from the standpoint of economy, economies that could have been effected if we had dismissed a lot of civilian professors and in their places put officers it was urged we should reduce. But these men had entered the academy as teachers under contracts, some of them extending for five years. They had been drawn from the different colleges and universities of the country. The members of the committee did not feel it was fair to them to have such a termination made of their services.

We did not feel that the department itself ought to be asked to bear the burden of criticism on account of expense of maintaining those teachers when they could substitute officers. For that reason we said we will shoulder up as a Congress, and we will provide that they shall maintain faculty members who are civilians under certain conditions. One condition was that a contract should not be broken. Another was that a man should receive six months' notice before dismissal, and, accordingly, largely with that thought in view, the language was put in.

Since then we have carried somewhat similar language and the Congress has assumed the responsibility of providing more money for the institution than the administrative head of the institution thought desirable from either the standpoint of economy or from the standpoint of most effective teaching of the branches that are taught in the academy.

Let me make one further statement. We have not carried the language this year because we feel now we have gotten down to a basis where the department would not want to reduce the civilian personnel further.

I do not know as to the charges made touching individual civilian professors who may have been dismissed. Maybe some abuses occurred. Abuses occur under any management of any institution, not willfully but through judgment that would not perhaps be your judgment or my judgment, but the language of the law is that no civilian professor, associate, or assistant professor or instructor shall be dismissed "except for sufficient cause" without six months' notice. Who is going to decide the question of sufficient cause? Shall we bring that question here, put it on the table in front of us, and all 435 Members of this House debate whether there was sufficient cause for dismissing Jones or Smith or Brown, a civilian instructor or professor at the academy? I do not think we want to do that. I wish to protect Smith or Jones or Brown at the academy, but we must maintain a principle, and that is that this legislative body is not created for the purpose of going into detail in the administration of an educational institution of this kind. We must place responsibility somewhere, we must place authority somewhere, and that authority has been placed in this instance with the department that has charge of the training of men to be officers of the Naval Establishment.

The gentleman has referred to Admiral Wilson. I can not undertake to analyze the action of Admiral Wilson touching any particular case, nor the final action of the department. Admiral Wilson is the administrative officer and is charged with responsibility that must be placed somewhere. If in the course of the matters that came under his administration a mistake could be pointed out here or there, it would not alter my respect for him, because I believe in his integrity. Admiral Wilson is a great man. As an officer he has a most distinguished record, and many are the young men who will be inspired through their careers as officers of the Navy because of their association with Admiral Wilson.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman may hold the floor about two minutes longer. I want to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anybody prefer a request for an extension of time?

Mr. FRENCH. I understood the gentleman to prefer a request for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho may proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOWREY. Did the committee consider the policy of giving commissions only to such graduates of Annapolis as are really needed, leaving the others for reserve naval officers in the future in case they should be needed?

Mr. FRENCH. We did consider that, and under the policy of permitting the Members of Congress to name three midshipmen, unless the department shall tighten up on resignations of officers, we are going to be hard pressed to find enough graduates to make up for the depletion of the service; but with tightening up on resignations we can have a sufficient number.

Mr. LOWREY. Is it not possible it would be a wise policy to continue to keep the institution filled in order to have reserve officers for the future, commissioning only those needed, and using the institution for the actual purpose of keeping a corps of reserve officers and not commissioning all of them?

Mr. FRENCH. Possibly that is so. I understand the legislative committee is considering the matter of modifying the policy touching number of officers of the various grades. Other factors enter into the question of number of officers we shall need, and the number which will prefer to stay in the Navy after graduation. We felt we had better await the action of the legislative committee before disturbing the present situation for this coming year.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a question. When the Committee on Appropriations reduced the number to be appointed to the academy from five to three, did my friend then think of waiting for congressional action through the legislative committee? They certainly gave it a rude disturbance then, and the whole House and I, too, joined with the gentleman in voting for the appropriation recommended, and I think I did what was wrong; but the gentleman came in here and reported an appropriation that starved out two of them.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman will remember that we reduced the number of midshipmen because we were reducing the enlisted personnel, and we felt that three could take care of the situation.

Mr. BUTLER. But the gentleman did not reduce the number of officers.

Mr. FRENCH. No; because we believed in a fairly large officer personnel.

Mr. BUTLER. I believe in the same thing.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. I have not addressed the committee since we started reading the bill and I do not intend to take but a few minutes. A few years ago, in 1921 and 1922, we had about 2,500 students and we had a large number of civilian professors who were introduced into the service during the war. I never knew a man to become associated with the pay roll of Uncle Sam who did not desire a continuation of the association. When the student body was reduced it was necessary that some of the civilian professors should be dismissed. Now we have but 1,900 students, and it follows that the commandant of the academy should reduce the number of civilian professors. At West Point we have six or seven civilian professors. Next year we will have at the Naval Academy 66. Can it be said that that discriminates against the civilian professors? The only objection I can make is that the commandant has not dispensed with the services of a sufficient number of civilians.

The two classes which are affected by the reduction in the number of midshipmen are the fourth class and the third class. And those are the classes where civilian professors are needed, the second and first classes teaching navigation and other subjects which should be taught by officers. The fact is that the commandant of the academy should make a greater reduction because of the reduced student body in the third and fourth classes, but he is going to reduce 10 officers and only 2 civilians. I do not think there is anything to show that Admiral Wilson has not lived up to the spirit as well as the letter of the law. The committee has followed this matter closely for the last two or three years and is convinced Admiral Wilson has lived up to the spirit of the law laid down by Congress for the protection of the civilian professors.

I take issue with the statement that Admiral Wilson has been any more arbitrary in the conduct of the academy than it is necessary for every executive to be in enforcing discipline and dispatching business. Responsibility must be lodged somewhere, and it would be unfortunate for the Naval Academy at Annapolis or for the academy at West Point to create the impression that every dissatisfied employee could appeal to Congress, there to have his complaint debated with no witnesses or information upon which we could form a correct conclusion.

So far as I am concerned I want to say that it is a matter of sincere regret to me that next February Admiral Wilson retires and will no longer head the Naval Academy at Annapolis. Instead of destroying the morale, from my knowledge of the Naval Academy, and I claim to know something of the conditions existing there, while the morale of two civilian professors may be injuriously affected, so far as the student body is concerned the morale was never better than it is to-day, and the splendid spirit of the academy is due in great measure to Admiral Wilson, as efficient a commandant as the academy has had. I believe the country owes a debt of gratitude to Admiral Wilson for the faithful and intelligent discharge of a very important and difficult task. [Applause.] He has conducted the affairs of the Naval Academy so as to give to the service splendid officers in the future, and at the same time has had an eye to the Treasury of the United States and some regard for the taxpayers of the United States. It would be easy for him to come here and ask for larger appropriations, but he has been honest with the committee. Instead of being arbitrary he has reported conditions to us, stating if we insisted that all these civilians be kept he would keep them, but that all of them were not necessary in view of the reduced number of students. For next year he proposes a reduction of only two. I think the committee will agree that he has rendered a service to the Congress and to the country.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I am quite in accord with the statement made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. This question about the civilian professors at Annapolis has arisen a number of times. I do not pretend to know the details about it and I would not undertake to form an independent opinion from my own personal knowledge. But judging from the conditions at West Point, and comparing the number of civilian professors there with the number of civilian professors at Annapolis, it is perfectly apparent that the Government is not being hurt by reducing the number of civilian professors. Generally speaking, naval instructors are better suited to train our boys for naval service. But entirely aside from that question, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I have the very highest respect for the opinion of Admiral Wilson in respect to matters connected with the Navy and, of course, with the matters connected with the Naval Academy.

Admiral Wilson has had a distinguished and honorable career, and the people of the country, as suggested by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] will owe him a great debt of gratitude for his service to the country when, in February, next year, he retires. In 1916 he became captain in command of the battleship *Pennsylvania*, the largest battleship afloat. In March, 1917, he had charge of the patrol force of the cruisers of the Atlantic coast.

In November, 1917, he had charge of the naval base on the coast of France. He became vice admiral in September, 1918, while serving in France. He became the commander of Squadron No. 4, of the Atlantic Fleet, in July, 1919, and was made commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet at that time. When the Navy had the combined fleet maneuvers at Panama, the great Atlantic Fleet and the great Pacific Fleet, I happened to be there. I stood upon a fortified island near the Pacific entrance with the Governor of Panama, and I watched the maneuvers of the great battleships and other fighting ma-

chinery of the American Navy, and it thrilled my heart with pride to see that fine Navy in those maneuvers. The officer who had entire command of the combined Fleet was Admiral Wilson.

He graduated from the academy in 1881, a year before I was born. Commencing away back there, covering a period of 45 years, he has given all of the best years of his life to his country, and he retires in February. I do not know how others feel about it, but I do not propose to disregard the views about naval affairs of a man who has given so many years to the service, whose career is without a blemish, and accept instead thereof the views of some one else who happens to think that there ought to be more civilian professors. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of employees at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Navy, as follows: Administration, \$154,800; department of ordnance and gunnery, \$16,952; departments of electrical engineering and physics, \$17,727; department of seamanship, \$8,880; department of marine engineering and naval construction, \$47,922; commissary department, \$188,993; department of buildings and grounds, \$131,794; in all, \$567,068.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last figures. I do this for the purpose of calling attention to the difference between the way in which the Military Academy and the Naval Academy are managed. We have never attempted to have a civilian faculty at West Point, with the exception of four or five professors. At the Military Academy the instructors are not changed every two years as they are at the Naval Academy, under the rule which provides that the naval officers assigned to the academy to teach have to go back to sea at the end of the second or third year at the most. In that way they can not remain a part of the permanent teaching staff at the institution. There is a continual change in the academy at Annapolis, and anyone who is familiar with educational institutions knows that that is a bad thing. That is not true at West Point. They have a permanent teaching force there, including the military officers. If we had a permanent force among the naval officers who teach at the Naval Academy, there would be no objection to them, because they could prepare themselves for that kind of work and stay with it. The objection is that they are changing all of the time. Several gentlemen who have spoken on this subject, particularly the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], spoke about reducing the number of civilian professors. No one has attempted to stop that. Congress has not attempted to prevent the reduction in the number of professors when they are not needed. The only thing that we have been attempting to do in the last three or four years is to prevent the removal of civilian professors and the substitution in their place of naval officers, so that the boys who are at the Naval Academy will have the benefit of trained instructors and trained educators in their efforts to get an education. The young men who go to the academy have no opportunity to go to any other educational institution, of course. It is their only opportunity to get an education, and some of us have been trying to make it a real educational institution rather than a mere naval training station.

Of course the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] with reference to Admiral Wilson and his naval career are interesting. I have not at any time criticized him as a naval officer. I have always spoken of him in high terms. There is no conflict upon that question; but the issue raised heretofore and still raised is that by temperament and for other reasons he is not particularly qualified to run an educational institution. I do not care how well qualified a man may be to command a battleship or a battle squadron, that does not prove that he is capable of properly conducting and managing an educational institution, and that is all there is to this controversy.

I wish the chairman of the committee would answer the further question that I asked a while ago: If they do not intend to further reduce the civilian faculty, why was the appropriation reduced so substantially in this bill?

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the amount that is carried in the bill is slightly less than the amount that will be used actually this year. In other words, we appropriated last year more than they will be able to use on the basis of the number of the faculty members they will need to have.

The Clerk read as follows:

Current and miscellaneous expenses, Naval Academy: For text and reference books for use of instructors; stationery, blank books and forms, models, maps, and periodicals; apparatus and materials for instruction in physical training and athletics; expenses of lectures

and entertainments, not exceeding \$1,000, including pay and expenses of lecturer; chemicals, philosophical apparatus, and instruments, stores, machinery, tools, fittings, apparatus, and materials for instruction purposes, \$77,800.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Referring again to this matter of instructors, what is the reason for the policy that is followed in the designation of naval officers as instructors at the academy for periods of only two years and then require that they shall be assigned to sea duty?

Mr. FRENCH. Whether or not a two-year period or a three-year period would be the right amount of time I would prefer to leave to be met by the officers of our Navy Department. The general thought is that an officer who comes from a battleship, a submarine, a destroyer, or some other great institution or an activity of the Navy Department to the academy as a teacher will be able to bring something new. In addition to scholarship he brings practical experience. In other words, he comes as a man to meet young men who are looking forward to a life in the very service in which he has been engaged and of which they dream. It is for the purpose not only of imparting information and giving instruction in academic studies but for the purpose of instilling into the midshipmen at the academy the spirit of the Navy. The midshipmen must go out commissioned officers with a broad view of the Naval Establishment upon their graduation from the academy, and they must be fired with the spirit of service if they would succeed.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, the distinction which the gentleman makes would apply very well to subjects that have to do with the technical work of the Navy.

Mr. FRENCH. And that is the place where it is stressed.

Mr. KETCHAM. Does the gentleman believe that instructors in mathematics or in history, or in any of the subjects not necessarily technical, would be so well equipped for their work by that continuous change? Does he not believe that frequently there are assigned to the Naval Academy men who from a pedagogical standpoint are not particularly well qualified for the work; proficient, no doubt, as naval officers, but without training, experience, or knowledge in relation to teaching? Does he believe that a system of selection of instructors that must frequently result in such assignments is for the best?

Mr. FRENCH. Of course, wherever you place administrative authority, there is danger of mistake, and I am afraid it will long be so in this world of ours. But let me say in response to the gentleman's suggestion that the branches that to a layman could most advantageously be handled by civilians are the ones that the administrative officers of the Navy say shall be handled by civilians. Thus, for the most part, the subjects the gentleman has mentioned are not taught by officers.

Mr. KETCHAM. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not want it to be understood that I am arguing for an increase of civilian instructors. If the teaching ability of naval officers assigned to the academy as instructors could be considered, I think I would favor an increase of such assignments. I am wondering whether there is any arbitrary plan by which these naval instructors are selected? Can the gentleman advise us on that point?

Mr. FRENCH. I would say this: In the first place the names of available officers are submitted to the head of the academy. He goes over them. He tries to ascertain from his own personal knowledge or through men who are in touch with the prospective members of the faculty whether or not they would be suitable for the work at hand. In other words, a selective process is followed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KETCHAM. I ask for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, in order to make my point clear may I call the attention of the committee to the fact that three of the limited number of Rhodes scholarships for next year have been bestowed on cadets at West Point.

To me that is an indication that the policy that has been adopted there of continuing Army men who have proven their ability as instructors is sound. A Rhodes scholarship is a splendid prize and does great honor to the person receiving it and to the college or university where he receives his training. Three such scholarships in one year from West Point puts the stamp of approval on their system of selecting instructors. I was wondering if something of the kind ought not to be worked out for our Naval Academy.

Mr. FRENCH. What is scholarship and why maintain an institution like the Naval Academy? The purpose of the

academy is to train young men to become officers in the Navy. Were that not the purpose we could depend upon our colleges and universities to turn out an adequate number of young men every year who would possess scholarship befitting an officer of the Navy. But that is not enough. A naval officer requires special and technical training. In the small compass of a submarine are technical mechanisms that should be placed in charge of only a specially trained man. And so of a battleship or a destroyer. And no less skill is required in ordnance or in aviation. Academic scholarship and technical training must go side by side.

I do not pretend to say what is the best plan for the Army, but we all know that the officer personnel of the Army is fed in large part from our colleges and universities. Not so with the Navy. For each branch of the service must be worked out the plan of training that is best. At Annapolis we concentrate more in engineering, in applied science, in curricula that deal more with technical branches. West Point is a great institution. Its purpose is to train for the Army, and I have no doubt the plan of training for Army service is adequate. The gentleman speaks of several West Point cadets attaining Rhodes scholarships and he regards this record as having special significance.

Surely it is a proud record, but may I remind the House that to West Point we send young men who are older by two years than the boys we send to Annapolis. Many of the young men who enter West Point are college graduates before they cross the threshold of that institution.

That an older type of young men should enter West Point than enter Annapolis is apparent. A West Point graduate goes out of the institution to take charge of men; a graduate of Annapolis goes out to take charge first of all of devices, of machinery, of problems, and finally of men. In other words, he must be a technically trained man, and to attain the best we have provided an entrance age younger by two years than that required for West Point.

On the whole, in answer to the gentleman, I believe in the judgment of the officers of the Navy as they have worked out a program of training of the young men who will assume with passing years the responsibility of officers of our Naval Establishment.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I will.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. A year ago last spring the Board of Visitors on behalf of Congress went over that matter very carefully at the Naval Academy. The question, as the chairman will recollect, was very thoroughly debated here a year ago on this appropriation bill. They reported they had gone over that matter not only with the authorities of the Naval Academy, but the gentlemen also stated they had gone over it very carefully with the authorities of the Navy Department, and they were making a selection of professors from the service for the Naval Academy with a very special view of their qualifications of the subjects that they were to teach as well as their teaching inspiration as service men. That policy still exists, does it not?

Mr. FRENCH. I believe so.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance and repairs, Naval Academy: For necessary repairs of public buildings, wharves, and walls inclosing the grounds of the Naval Academy, improvements, repairs, and fixtures; for books, periodicals, maps, models, and drawings; purchase and repair of fire engines; fire apparatus and plants, machinery; purchase and maintenance of all horses and horse-drawn vehicles for use at the academy, including the maintenance, operation, and repair of three horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles to be used only for official purposes; seeds and plants; tools and repairs of the same; stationery; furniture for Government buildings and offices at the academy, including furniture for midshipmen's rooms; coal and other fuels; candles, oil, and gas; attendance on light and power plants; cleaning and clearing up station and care of buildings; attendance on fires, lights, fire engines, fire apparatus, and plants, and telephone, telegraph, and clock systems; incidental labor; advertising, water tax, postage, telephones, telegrams, tolls, and ferrage; flags and awnings; packing boxes, fuel for heating and lighting bandsmen's quarters; pay of inspectors and draftsmen; music and astronomical instruments; and for pay of employees on leave, \$1,000,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on page 43, line 8, I move to strike out the word "postage." It is a pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 43, line 8, strike out the word "postage."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there is a movement right now on foot in this Capitol to use the report of an alleged bribery by some officer in the Capitol as an excuse for turning down the postal pay bill. They ought to get some better excuse than that. Why, among all the thousands of postal employees as a class maybe you will find some dishonest one as in every other class or organization, some one who might attempt to bribe, but as a class these postal employees are honest. Are you going to visit a wholesale punishment upon the whole class because one individual may be dishonest? Are you going to deny every one of those men this deserved increase pay because some one in their fold may have done wrong? I say that is an excuse that is ridiculous, and I hope that the movement on foot right now to use this incident as an excuse to uphold the veto of the President will be abandoned.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I did not want to take up but a minute, but I will yield.

Mr. BEGG. I do not know to whom the gentleman had reference, but certainly the gentleman knows there is no opportunity for us on this side to vote on the veto.

Mr. BLANTON. That is true, because the bill is not before us. I am talking about an excuse for sustaining the President's veto, to kill this bill that is pending in another body.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman ought to make his speech in the other body.

Mr. BLANTON. I would if I were there; but, unfortunately for the country, I am not there. [Laughter.]

Mr. BEGG. I would suggest to the gentleman to try to get there.

Mr. BLANTON. I would prefer just now to stay here with the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BEGG. I will tender my services to assist you.

Mr. BLANTON. Coming over to the Capitol this morning I heard a very distinguished gentleman say, "There is no chance in the world for the postal salary bill to be passed now, since this bribery question has come up." I immediately protested against such statement. Such a punishment to be visited upon a whole organization of honorable Government employees simply because one has side-stepped and gone wrong would be unjust and inexcusable. The gentleman from Ohio knows that is no excuse whatever and ought not to be considered by anybody.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INCREASE OF THE NAVY

The Secretary of the Navy may use the unexpended balances on the date of the approval of this act under appropriations heretofore made on account of "Increase of the Navy," together with the sum of \$6,944,000, which is hereby appropriated for the prosecution of work on vessels under construction on such date, the construction of which may be proceeded with under the terms of the treaty providing for the limitation of naval armament; for continuing the conversion of two battle cruisers into aircraft carriers including their complete equipment of aircraft and aircraft accessories, in accordance with the terms of such treaty; toward the construction of two fleet submarines heretofore authorized, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action and to cost not to exceed \$5,300,000 each for construction and machinery and \$850,000 each for armor, armament, and ammunition; for the settlement of contracts on account of vessels already delivered to the Navy Department; for the procurement of gyro compass equipments, and for the installation of fire-control instruments on destroyers not already supplied; for the installation of fire-control apparatus on the *Colorado* and *West Virginia*; and for the completion of armor, armament, ammunition, and torpedoes for the supply and complement of vessels which may be proceeded with as hereinbefore mentioned.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. The purpose is to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee as to the amount of the unexpended balances provided on page 48 that are authorized to be used.

Mr. FRENCH. The amount that will be available by July 1, of course, is somewhat problematical, but I should say that it would be approximately \$10,000,000. Sometimes there are factors that enter into the situation that we can not anticipate; for instance, whether or not a certain material can be obtained. It may delay the use of moneys that otherwise could be used, just as it did touching engineering, as I explained in my general statement. But it will be approximately \$10,000,000.

Mr. RATHBONE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RATHBONE: After line 13, page 49, amend by inserting a new paragraph in lieu thereof, as follows:

"The President is requested to enter into negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan with a view to reaching an understanding or agreement relative to limiting the construction of all types and sizes of subsurface and surface craft of 10,000 tons standard displacement or less and of aircraft whenever there appears to be a reasonable prospect of agreement in a further limitation of competitive armaments."

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

Mr. TABER. I make a point of order against the amendment, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that the amendment is legislation upon an appropriation bill. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RATHBONE] care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RATHBONE. I will ask the gentleman from New York to reserve his point of order for a moment.

Mr. TABER. I do not think it should be reserved, in view of the recent statement by the President on the subject. The statement of the President is well understood, and it expresses the sentiment of the country absolutely, and it places the Government in a position that is foursquare.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman from New York, as I understand it, says this is legislation. What legislation does it propose? It is simply a warrant to the Executive to authorize his power in a line where Congress had no authority to compel him to do anything in the exercise of his power. It is simply a polite suggestion; that is all.

Mr. RATHBONE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard upon the point of order.

I will say that the position that I have taken is this: This is in identical language, I believe, with the so-called Byrnes amendment which was offered by the gentleman from South Carolina at the last session on the occasion when the naval bill was under consideration.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RATHBONE. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the gentleman first get the permission of the committee before he offered this amendment?

Mr. RATHBONE. I will ask the gentleman from Texas if he is asking that as a serious question?

Mr. BLANTON. Unless he did, he will have no chance to get this carried on the bill.

Mr. WINGO. Has this passed the Budget?

Mr. RATHBONE. I will state to the gentleman in reply that this is offered on my own motion solely. I will endeavor to explain my position to the Chair and to the House.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman by his own statement admits that he is out of order. The gentleman's last statement puts him out of order. Under the new Budget no Member has the right to offer an amendment on his own responsibility to the House.

Mr. RATHBONE. I am grateful to the gentleman for his statement, but I shall endeavor to proceed in my own way.

Mr. Chairman, as I was stating, this is the identical resolution that was adopted by this House at the last session when the naval bill was pending.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. RATHBONE. I yield.

Mr. BEGG. Did anybody make a point of order against the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. RATHBONE. I believe not.

Mr. BEGG. What force, then, is there in that argument?

Mr. RATHBONE. The force is that if it was good then, it is good now.

Mr. BEGG. If nobody challenged it, how does he know whether it was good or bad?

Mr. RATHBONE. So far as this point is concerned, the point that has been raised, that it is legislation, does not offer any ground of objection at all.

The CHAIRMAN. For the information of the gentleman, the Chair will say that if the amendment is agreed to it becomes a part of the bill and becomes a part of the law. Is not that legislation?

Mr. RATHBONE. No, sir. It is not legislation in any sense of the word.

Mr. STENGLE. Is it germane?

Mr. RATHBONE. The point as to its germaneness has not been raised.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Ohio on the point of order.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, it is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WINGO. Is not this the amendment that was offered to the appropriation bill last year?

Mr. BEGG. That makes no difference. The gentleman knows that that does not amount to anything.

Mr. WINGO. Yes; it does make a difference, because I want to get some information from my friend. If it is the same as the one that was put on the appropriation bill last session, that was a request upon the President, and I want to ask my friend from Illinois [Mr. RATHBONE] whether he thinks the President has forgotten about it and whether the gentleman from Illinois wants to renew the invitation or request?

Mr. RATHBONE. I have no idea the President has forgotten about it. I am offering this amendment at the present time in order that it may be known to all the world that the Congress of the United States stands now where it stood at the last session. This is offered in good faith.

Mr. WINGO. I challenge that statement. The Republican papers, especially the chief organ of this administration, announced the day this Congress convened that the Congress which was repudiated in November reconvenes in December, so we evidently do not stand where we did at the last session.

Mr. RATHBONE. I am going to state my position.

Mr. WINGO. Of course, George Harvey should certainly be an authority for my Republican friend.

Mr. RATHBONE. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield any further until I have had a reasonable opportunity to state my position before this House.

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Is the gentleman discussing the point of order or the issue before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not hear the point of order made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STENGLE. I say, the gentleman from Illinois is not discussing the point of order at all, but, rather, the subject which is contained in his amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the point of order, that it is a point in the third degree.

Mr. RATHBONE. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to have the Chair rule on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems clear to the Chair that the amendment is legislation. It is in no sense a proper part of an appropriation bill; it in no way limits any appropriation that has been proposed or retrenches expenditures, and it can not be anything but substantive law. So far as the effect of the language may be concerned, whether it is in the nature of a direction to or a request of the Chief Executive, those are issues with which the Chair is not concerned in the determination of the point of order.

Mr. RATHBONE. If the Chair pleases, so far as it being a matter of substantive law is concerned, I submit that can not be the case. Law has been well defined to be a rule of action. This does not require any action whatever; it is a mere invitation or request. [Laughter.] I repeat it. It does not require any action whatever; it is not compulsory; it is a mere polite request, and it is an indication by this Congress that we stand in favor of retrenchment; that we wish to carry out and intend to carry out, as far as possible, the work of the Washington conference, which was a step in the right direction. I am in favor of this bill; I intend to vote for it, and I think this amendment constitutes a proper amendment to the bill. It is a supplement to it and the bill is not complete without it. The bill is likely to be misunderstood elsewhere if we do not have this amendment. Why should gentlemen object to this amendment in the interest of peace? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrets he can not agree with his colleague from Illinois, and sustains the point of order.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKEOWN: Page 48, line 18, after the word "Navy" strike out "together with the sum of \$6,944,000."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, essentially that is for the building program and for the purpose of carrying on the work on the two airship carriers and the work on the submarines, one of them authorized last year and begun, the other two to be laid down, provided this bill shall go through.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of any appropriation made for the Navy shall be expended for any of the purposes herein provided for on account of the Navy Department in the District of Columbia, including personal services of civilians and of enlisted men of the Navy, except as herein expressly authorized: *Provided*, That there may be detailed to the Bureau of Navigation not to exceed at any one time 24 enlisted men of the Navy: *Provided further*, That enlisted men detailed to the Naval Dispensary and the Radio Communication Service shall not be regarded as detailed to the Navy Department in the District of Columbia.

Mr. RATHBONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to have my position clearly understood and not misunderstood by this House. No one goes further than I do in respect for the executive head of this Nation. I would not willfully do anything to embarrass him under any circumstances. I have read carefully his expression as referred to by the gentleman from Ohio and I see absolutely nothing in the amendment that has just been offered here which could in any way embarrass him. There is no compulsion about it; there is no thought or suggestion of restraint about it. It is in line with what we have done in the Borah amendment, in the Byrnes amendment, and on other occasions. The President of the United States has signified a willingness, if I interpret his language aright, to call another conference for the limitation of armaments, but he hesitates, perhaps, for two reasons. If you will study his language closely, first of all he does not want this country to become entangled with the League of Nations. That can all be avoided. Any conference called by him can stand absolutely upon its own footing and it does not need to be in any way involved with the League of Nations.

It can be an independent move of this country just as the Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armament was.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RATHBONE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Does not the gentleman think he would be more in order if he offered a resolution calling upon the President to ask the Secretary of State why he stopped short in the disarmament conference and why he stopped when he cut down our fleet and did not cut down the others?

Mr. RATHBONE. I will say to the gentleman that I have heard the Washington conference and its results belittled upon this floor, and I make bold to say it was one of the greatest achievements known to man. For thousands of years humanity had dreamed of being able to limit armament and to stop the mad race of competitive armaments, which was piling up the burden of taxation upon the shoulders of the overtaxed people of the world.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RATHBONE. I decline to yield until I have concluded my remarks, and then I will yield to the gentleman or to anyone else.

For the first time in the history of the human race men were able to gather about the council table and to stop this feverish competition in armaments, to reduce taxation, to insure the peace of the world, and what has the Washington conference accomplished? It has achieved many acts of justice. Japan has returned Shantung, the question of Siberia has been settled. We have obtained recognition, after over 20 years of vain insistence, of our doctrine of the open door in China. We have brought about the scrapping of the Anglo-Japanese alliance. We have brought the reign of peace to this hemisphere and to the Orient. The Washington conference was a step in the right direction. It ought to be followed up, at the proper time, in the discretion of the President, by another step in the same direction, and that is all that this amendment offers. Let me reiterate—

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RATHBONE. Just as soon as I have concluded I will gladly yield, if I may have a little more time.

In the first place, the President of the United States could not be embarrassed, because this leaves entirely in his hands, according to his best judgment, when to call this conference or whether to call it or not. How could he be embarrassed under those circumstances?

I yield now to the gentleman from New York, who, I think, was on his feet first.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I was just wondering if the gentleman realizes that, although the Washington conference is supposed to have stopped this mad race of armament, to-

day, at this very minute, we are appropriating money to build a larger Navy, and Japan is doing the same thing, and Great Britain is doing the same thing. Would this have happened if they had completely reduced armament at the time of the Washington conference?

Mr. RATHBONE. The Washington conference has been eminently successful in doing what it set out to do. It was limited in its object, which was the reduction of armament in capital ships.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RATHBONE. Not for the moment, until I have completed my statement.

No one can say but what it has wholly accomplished that purpose. It has saved millions of dollars to the taxpayers and has insured peace.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield now? Has the gentleman read the minutes of the disarmament conference?

Mr. RATHBONE. I have read part of the minutes and I have read much about it.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Does the gentleman realize that our Secretary of State offered a plan to that conference whereby they would reduce all the way down the line, and that when he had reduced our strength he stopped short. His plan was for a general disarmament and was not a reduction of capital tonnage alone.

Mr. RATHBONE. I will answer the gentleman by saying that the gentleman is in error about that.

Mr. STEVENSON. I would like to ask the gentleman how many authorities and how many requests it will be necessary to propound to the President in order to get him to call such a conference? We passed this same thing last year, and it is in effect now, as the gentleman stated. If the President thinks it is judicious, does not the gentleman think the President has the authority from this same Congress in this same language to call such a conference, and how many times does the gentleman think we will have to repeat it in order to get the President to call it? A similar amendment was passed last May.

Mr. RATHBONE. I will answer the gentleman. In my judgment the President does not need any suggestion whatever from us, but it is well that we, the House of Representatives, should continue on record, in spite of the jingo talk we have heard, in spite of the things that have been said upon the floor of this House, as in favor of any and every reasonable step that can be taken to insure the peace of the world. Let us clarify the situation. Let us make known our attitude to all the world, so that there can be no mistake about where the House of Representatives stands; that while we stand for an adequate defense, while we stand for this bill as upholding the strength of the American Navy, yet we stand for something more than that, and that is the peace of the world and the cooperation and friendship of nations.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RATHBONE. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WATKINS. If what the gentleman from New York has just said is true, and I do not want to question the gentleman's veracity, then there is more reason for the calling of a conference than if what he said was not true.

Mr. BLACK of New York. That is true.

Mr. RATHBONE. I do not think I get the point of the gentleman.

Mr. WATKINS. If we had a conference and they are not going by it, there is more need for the gentleman's resolution at this time and we ought to keep on until they do call one.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, that there may be no misapprehension as to the attitude of the great President of the United States and the policy of the administration touching the disarmament conference, I am going to ask that the Clerk read at the desk the words of the President to this Congress within the month on the subject of a disarmament conference.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will read, in the time of the gentleman from Idaho.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Many times I have expressed my desire to see the work of the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armament appropriately supplemented by further agreements for a further reduction and for the purpose of diminishing the menace and waste of the competition in preparing instruments of international war. It has been and is my expectation that we might hopefully approach other great powers for further conference on this subject as soon as the carrying out of the present reparation plan as the established and settled

policy of Europe has created a favorable opportunity. But on account of proposals which have already been made by other governments for a European conference, it will be necessary to wait to see what the outcome of their actions may be. I should not wish to propose or have representatives attend a conference which would contemplate commitments opposed to the freedom of action we desire to maintain unimpaired with respect to our purely domestic policies.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. Mr. Chairman, as the author of the amendment to the last naval appropriation bill which passed Congress in May, I simply want to say that I have not changed my views as to the wisdom or necessity of a further conference. I have not offered the amendment at this time solely because I believe this Congress has gone on record stating its views. I said two days ago in general debate and repeat that I am in great doubt as to what the President meant by the language which has just been read at the desk.

Shortly after the Congress passed the last naval appropriation bill with the request that he invite the naval powers of the world to a further conference for the limitation of armament, the press carried the statement that just as soon as the Dawes reparation question was settled and the program agreed to by the European governments, an invitation would probably be extended for the purpose of further limiting naval armament.

Though the Dawes reparation program has been adopted by the various Governments, the President now says he does not deem it wise to invite the nations to a further conference until some action has been taken upon the proposal made to hold a conference in Europe because he does not want to have representatives attend a conference which would contemplate commitments opposed to the freedom of action we desire to maintain as to domestic policies.

Exactly what he means I do not know. I must say that the maintenance of a navy is a domestic question, and in the interest of world peace we sacrificed our freedom of action and limited battleships at the Washington conference. I am not encouraged by that statement. I fear that the President may not send representatives to Geneva. I hope sincerely that he will, because I know that this naval bill carries \$290,000,000, and, as I said two days ago, within the next 30 days the Congress will be called upon to appropriate an additional \$25,000,000 to complete the two aircraft carriers and construct the airplanes to go on those carriers. In addition the Navy Department has asked the Budget Bureau for \$55,000,000 to begin the program of construction authorized in the so-called modernization act. If the Budget Bureau approves it, if the President adopts it and sends these estimates to Congress, it will add \$80,000,000 to the naval bill for this year, making \$370,000,000. And from this year on it is certain that in the absence of an agreement further limiting armaments the naval budget of the United States is going to amount to \$350,000,000 or \$375,000,000, annually.

I know that it is for the best interests of the taxpayers of the United States that the President should send a representative of this Government to Geneva to attend the disarmament conference that is to be held there, even if it is held under the auspices of the League of Nations. We have been sending representatives to one or two other conferences suggested by that organization, and certainly we should send representatives to this conference which holds more hope for the peace of the world and for the relief of the taxpayers of America than any other proposal now pending before the people of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. RATHBONE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. RATHBONE. Is not it a fact that it has appeared in the foreign press and the press of this country since the delivery of the President's message on December 3, 1924, that the prospects of such a conference referred to in his message are much less than they were; that the change in the British Government, the reversal of policy, apparently, of some leading nations over there, have wrought a change since this expression by the President which may make it inadvisable, in his best judgment, to make this move? Is not that true?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I know from the debates in the House of Commons that the government which was recently defeated was enthusiastically in favor of such a conference, but that is true of the government now in control. But I think the gentleman is exactly correct and that representatives of other governments who realize that the success of such a conference is dependent upon our willingness to participate will be impressed as I have been impressed by the statement of the President. I am satisfied that in his heart he is as earnestly in favor of furthering the limitation of

armament as I am. But I do not want him to be frightened away from carrying into execution what he really desires because this disarmament conference may happen to be called under the auspices of the League of Nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RATHBONE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina be granted one more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the several amendments back to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10724) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded upon any amendment?

Mr. FRENCH. I demand a separate vote upon the Sears amendment, which occurred on page 39, following line 5.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put the other amendments en gross. The question is on agreeing to the other amendments.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 39, after line 5, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Submarine base, Key West, \$100,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SEARS of Florida) there were—ayes 48, noes 49.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the vote upon the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. It is clear that there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on agreeing to the Sears amendment.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 110, nays 122, answered "present" 1, not voting 198, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—110

Abernethy	Cullen	Kinchloe	Reed, Ark.
Allen	Davis, Tenn.	King	Romjue
Allgood	Deal	Lanham	Rubey
Almon	Dickinson, Mo.	Lankford	Sanders, Tex.
Arnold	Drewry	Lazaro	Sandlin
Aswell	Favrot	Lowrey	Sears, Fla.
Bankhead	Fisher	McClintic	Sites
Barkley	Fulmer	McDuffie	Stedman
Bell	Gambrill	McKeown	Stengle
Black, N. Y.	Gardner, Ind.	McReynolds	Stevenson
Black, Tex.	Garnier, Tex.	McSwain	Swank
Bland	Gasque	Major, Mo.	Taylor, Tenn.
Blanton	Gibson	Mansfield	Taylor, W. Va.
Bowling	Gilbert	Martin	Thomas, Okla.
Box	Greenwood	Minahan	Tillman
Boyce	Hammer	Moore, Ga.	Tucker
Briggs	Hawes	Moore, Va.	Underwood
Busby	Hayden	Morehead	Upshaw
Cannon	Hill, Ala.	O'Connell, R. I.	Vinson, Ky.
Casey	Hill, Wash.	O'Connor, La.	Watkins
Clark, Fla.	Huddleston	Oldfield	Weaver
Cleary	Hudspeth	Park, Ga.	Williams, Tex.
Collier	Hull, Tenn.	Quin	Wilson, Ind.
Collins	Humphreys	Ragon	Wilson, La.
Connery	Jeffers	Rainey	Wingo
Cook	Johnson, Tex.	Raker	Woodrum
Crisp	Jones	Rankin	
Croll	Kerr	Rayburn	

NAYS—122

Ackerman	Dowell	Leatherwood	Robison, Ky.
Andrew	Edmonds	Leavitt	Sanders, Ind.
Bacharach	Elliot	Lehlbach	Schafer
Bacon	Evans, Iowa	Longworth	Scott
Barbour	Faust	Lozier	Shreve
Beedy	Fish	McFadden	Sinclair
Begg	Fleetwood	McLaughlin, Mich.	Speaks
Boles	Frear	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sproul, Ill.
Britten	Free	McSweeney	Stalker
Brumm	French	MacGregor	Stephens
Buchanan	Frothingham	MacLafferty	Strong, Kans.
Burdick	Fuller	Magee, N. Y.	Strong, Pa.
Burness	Griest	Major, Ill.	Summers, Wash.
Burton	Guyer	Manlove	Swing
Butler	Hadley	Mapes	Taber
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardy	Michener	Temple
Cable	Hersey	Miller, Wash.	Thatcher
Chindblom	Hill, Md.	Moore, Ind.	Thompson
Christopherson	Hoch	Morgan	Vaile
Clague	Hudson	Newton, Minn.	Vincent, Mich.
Cable, N. Y.	Hull, Iowa	Newton, Mo.	Voigt
Cole, Iowa	Hull, M. D.	Oliver, Ala.	Walwright
Cole, Ohio	Hull, W. E.	Patterson	Wason
Colton	Jacobstein	Purnell	Watres
Connolly, Pa.	Johnson, Wash.	Ramseyer	White, Kans.
Cooper, Wis.	Ketcham	Ransley	Williams, Mich.
Cramton	Kopp	Rathbone	Williamson
Curry	Kurtz	Reece	Winter
Darrow	Kvale	Reid, Ill.	Wurzbach
Denison	Lampert	Roach	
Dickinson, Iowa	Leach	Robinson, Iowa	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Timberlake

NOT VOTING—198

Aldrich	Fulbright	McKenzie	Schneider
Anderson	Funk	McLeod	Sears, Nebr.
Anthony	Gallivan	McNulty	Seger
Ayres	Garber	Madden	Shallenberger
Beck	Garrett, Tenn.	Magee, Pa.	Sherwood
Beers	Garrett, Tex.	Mead	Simmons
Berger	Geran	Merritt	Sinnott
Bixler	Gifford	Michaelson	Smith
Bloom	Glatfelter	Miller, Ill.	Smithwick
Boylan	Goldsborough	Milligan	Snell
Brand, Ga.	Graham	Mills	Snyder
Brand, Ohio	Green	Montague	Spearing
Browne, N. J.	Griffin	Mooney	Sproul, Kans.
Browne, Wis.	Hall	Moore, Ill.	Steagall
Browning	Harrison	Moore, Ohio	Sullivan
Buckley	Hastings	Morin	Sumners, Tex.
Bulwinkle	Haugen	Morris	Sweet
Byrns, Tenn.	Hawley	Morrow	Swoope
Campbell	Hickey	Murphy	Tague
Candfield	Holaday	Nelson, Me.	Taylor, Colo.
Carew	Hooker	Nelson, Wis.	Thomas, Ky.
Carter	Howard, Nebr.	Nolan	Tilson
Celler	Howard, Okla.	O'Brien	Tincher
Clancy	James	O'Connell, N. Y.	Tinkham
Connally, Tex.	Johnson, Ky.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Treadway
Cooper, Ohio	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Sullivan	Tydings
Corning	Johnson, W. Va.	Oliver, N. Y.	Underhill
Crosser	Jost	Palge	Vare
Crowther	Kearns	Parker	Vestal
Cummings	Keller	Parks, Ark.	Vinson, Ga.
Dallinger	Kelly	Peavey	Ward, N. C.
Davey	Kendall	Peery	Ward, N. Y.
Davis, Minn.	Kent	Perkins	Watson
Dempsey	Kiess	Perlman	Wefald
Dickstein	Kindred	Phillips	Weller
Dominick	Knutson	Porter	Welsh
Doughton	Kunz	Pou	Wertz
Doyle	LaGuardia	Prall	White, Me.
Drane	Langley	Quayle	Williams, Ill.
Driver	Larsen, Ga.	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, Miss.
Dyer	Larson, Minn.	Reed, W. Va.	Winslow
Eagan	Lea, Calif.	Richards	Wolf
Evans, Mont.	Lee, Ga.	Rogers, Mass.	Wood
Fairchild	Lilly	Rogers, N. H.	Woodruff
Fairfield	Lindsay	Rosenbloom	Wright
Fenn	Lineberger	Rouse	Wyant
Fitzgerald	Linthicum	Sabbath	Yates
Foster	Logan	Salmon	Zihlman
Fredericks	Luce	Sanders, N. Y.	
Freeman	Lyon	Schall	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Timberlake (for) with Mr. Sinnott (against).
 Mr. O'Sullivan (for) with Mr. Fenn (against).
 Mr. Kindred (for) with Mr. Gifford (against).
 Mr. Drane (for) with Mr. McLeod (against).
 Mr. Smithwick (for) with Mr. Sweet (against).
 Mr. Carew (for) with Mr. Bixler (against).
 Mr. O'Connell of New York (for) with Mr. Wertz (against).
 Mr. Quayle (for) with Mr. Swoope (against).
 Mr. Sullivan (for) with Mr. Snell (against).
 Mr. Weller (for) with Mr. Davis of Minnesota (against).
 Mr. Bloom (for) with Mr. Beers (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Vare with Mr. Montague.
 Mr. Snyder with Mr. Vinson of Georgia.
 Mr. Morin with Mr. Byrns of Tennessee.
 Mr. Porter with Mr. Ayres.
 Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Linthicum.
 Mr. Watson with Mr. Peery.
 Mr. Williams of Illinois with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.
 Mr. Seger with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Garber with Mr. Hastings.

Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Buckley.
 Mr. Cooper of Ohio with Mr. Eagan.
 Mr. Fairchild with Mr. Garrett of Tennessee.
 Mr. Lineberger with Mr. Clancy.
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Dominick.
 Mr. Tilson with Mr. Morrow.
 Mr. Phillips with Mr. Prall.
 Mr. Tinkham with Mr. Wright.
 Mr. Winslow with Mr. Bulwinkle.
 Mr. Simmons with Mr. Crosser.
 Mr. Treadway with Mr. Boylan.
 Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Fulbright.
 Mr. Luce with Mr. Howard of Nebraska.
 Mr. Merritt with Mr. Jost.
 Mr. Fredericks with Mr. Cummings.
 Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Browning.
 Mr. Foster with Mr. Milligan.
 Mr. Mills with Mr. Steagall.
 Mr. Kiess with Mr. Tydings.
 Mr. Dallinger with Mr. Mead.
 Mr. Crowther with Mr. Wilson of Mississippi.
 Mr. Kendall with Mr. Oliver of New York.
 Mr. Anthony with Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire.
 Mr. Moore of Ohio with Mr. Shallenberger.
 Mr. Aldrich with Mr. Connally of Texas.
 Mr. Nelson of Maine with Mr. Davey.
 Mr. Perkins with Mr. Johnson of Kentucky.
 Mr. Vestal with Mr. Lindsay.
 Mr. Murphy with Mr. Geran.
 Mr. Rogers of Massachusetts with Mr. Gallivan.
 Mr. Sears of Nebraska with Mr. Canfield.
 Mr. Hawley with Mr. Sherwood.
 Mr. Graham with Mr. Logan.
 Mr. Anderson with Mr. Spearing.
 Mr. Brand of Ohio with Mr. Lyon.
 Mr. James with Mr. Thomas of Kentucky.
 Mr. Green with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
 Mr. Browne of Wisconsin with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
 Mr. Campbell with Mr. Mooney.
 Mr. Kearns with Mr. Pou.
 Mr. LaGuardia with Mr. Salmon.
 Mr. Dyer with Mr. Morris.
 Mr. McKenzie with Mr. O'Brien.
 Mr. Magee of Pennsylvania with Mr. Parks of Arkansas.
 Mr. Funk with Mr. Sabbath.
 Mr. Freeman with Mr. Richards.
 Mr. Perlman with Mr. Corning.
 Mr. Tincher with Mr. Driver.
 Mr. Moore of Illinois with Mr. Lea of California.
 Mr. Sanders of New York with Mr. Doughton.
 Mr. Wood with Mr. Lilly.
 Mr. Parker with Mr. Dickstein.
 Mr. Wyant with Mr. Kunz.
 Mr. Sproul of Kansas with Mr. Lee of Georgia.
 Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Hooker.
 Mr. Fairfield with Mr. Celler.
 Mr. Larson of Minnesota with Mr. Browne of New Jersey.
 Mr. Haugen with Mr. Doyle.
 Mr. Fitzgerald with Mr. Glatfelter.
 Mr. Kelly with Mr. Evans of Montana.
 Mr. Holaday with Mr. Brand of Georgia.
 Mr. Underhill with Mr. Garrett of Texas.
 Mrs. Nolan with Mr. Griffin.
 Mr. Welsh with Mr. Harrison.
 Mr. White of Maine with Mr. Larsen of Georgia.
 Mr. Smith with Mr. Johnson of West Virginia.
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Howard of Oklahoma.
 Mr. Zihlman with Mr. Sumners of Texas.
 Mr. Ward of New York with Mr. Tague.
 Mr. Reed of West Virginia with Mr. McNulty.
 Mr. Hall with Mr. Wefald.
 Mr. Keller with Mr. Wolff.
 Mr. Miller of Illinois with Mr. Berger.
 Mr. Paige with Mr. Kent.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present; the Doorkeeper will open the doors. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 156, noes 17.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. FRENCH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIEF HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRESENT RAILROAD SITUATION

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the historical development of railroad legislation, my own production.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Speaker, there are now 10,900 bills before this House and 3,700 in the Senate. It is both a physical and mental impossibility to give each thorough consideration.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am a member, has before it many bills which relate to the control, regulation, and direction of railroads.

For my individual information I have attempted to arrive at some understanding of the past history of railroads and legislation affecting them and to bring this subject down to date in condensed form, not for the benefit of experts or with the thought that it will influence those persons who have given study to the subject but rather that the average Member or the private citizen, in considering changes in our present law, may have before him a brief historical statement of the development of this subject.

I doubt if the public is fully aware of the enormity of the task presented by the simplest bill relating to the operation, management, or control of railroads.

No part of this subject can be considered except in its relation to the whole. It is necessary to understand the magnitude of the subject and how it is all related one part with another.

We can not confiscate without payment. We must not merely destroy. Therefore the first essential in the consideration of any change in existing law is a knowledge of all the facts relating to the problem.

In the affairs of life we are guided by experience, and experience is largely a matter of history. It is the knowledge of what has gone before or of things that have occurred to the individual or the Nation which must be considered in any contemplated change.

A doctor studies the past history of his patient; a lawyer assembles his facts before he looks for the law; a man purchasing a business first reviews its past conduct and possibilities. Therefore in proposing changes in railroad law, a knowledge of what has gone before is necessary.

Transportation of all kinds will ultimately become a related subject because the connection between water, rail, and highway is daily forming closer contact, and soon we may have the addition of practical air transportation.

FIRST RAILROAD

What is now the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad obtained its charter in 1827, and the ground was broken on July 4, 1828, by Charles Carroll, the then only surviving signer of the American Declaration of Independence. It is recorded that on opening the ceremony this venerable patriot said:

I consider this among the most important acts of my life, second only to that of signing the Declaration of Independence, even if second to that.

Professor Hadley, writing in 1885, stated:

One man's life formed the connecting link between the political revolution of the last century and the industrial revolution of the present. That was but 96 years ago.

In 1830 the Baltimore road had only 13 miles of track in operation; in 1831, the Mohawk 17 miles. In 1852 the famous "Old Ironsides" was placed in operation, having no brakes, brought to a stop by reversing the engine, weighing 7 tons, and costing finally \$3,500.

Baldwin, founder of the vast engine works that now bears his name, started in 1832. He had been a watchmaker by trade. The cars that followed his first engine were the old Concord stages with their wheels adapted to rails.

Five years later, or about 1835, the infant railroads were stretching themselves in all directions. Albany and Utica were connected by rail. Two hundred miles of the present Pennsylvania system had been laid in Pennsylvania, the Columbia section having been built by the State, and Philadelphia was connected with the Ohio River at Pittsburgh. The Reading road opened later. Three lines were sent out from Boston. Providence, Lowell, and other manufacturing centers were connected up.

The State was reluctant to aid, but private capital went into the expansion.

From 23 miles of road in 1830 there was an increase to 2,818 miles in 1840. By 1850 there were 9,021 miles of railroad in the United States. The great industrial centers of the East were connected with each other and with the sea. Small progress had been made in the South.

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS LATER

Twenty-five years from the date of the first railroad brings us into a 10-year period of railroad building in the United States, perhaps the most important years of our growth.

From 1850 to 1860 the road mileage increased from 9,000 to 30,600 miles. In 1855 the Baltimore road had 139 engines, 2,567 freight cars, and 96 passenger cars.

Westward and southward the lines pushed on. By rail and canal, with a few interruptions of changing cars, the East was connected with the West, first from New York to Philadelphia,

then to Parkersburg, then to Cincinnati, thence to St. Louis. Two rivers were ferried and passengers changed cars five times. But the East and the West had begun to annihilate distance.

All this was not accomplished without struggle. Private capital was available, but the early days were marked by heated contests between the pioneer railroad builders—visionary they were called at times—and the State.

In Pennsylvania State aid was obtained only after the most contentious deliberations. Early appeals for land grants and stock subscriptions were not met with a ready response. The cost of construction of the roads was six times the early estimates, each mile ranging in the neighborhood of \$44,000. Predictions of returns on investment were scoffed at. In this State a board of commissioners finally saw the possibilities of the steam road and, after insisting against what looked to be great odds, in 1841 officially recognized the steam locomotive.

In New York public sentiment was against State aid in road building. "Visionary" pioneers, however, began to survey on a limited capital, estimates were made on investments and returns, and again, after a bitter struggle, New York gave the credit of the State not to exceed \$3,000,000 for the construction of roads. In 1839 a legislature of New York asked for the surrender of the charter of the largest railroad and its property as well. The bill lost by only one vote.

In 1850, however, it was seen that railroads were both necessary and practical. Canal building stopped and attention was turned to public assistance for the roads.

Favorable factors were the increase of money and the boom that resulted from the discovery of gold in California. Settlers started west and populated new States. Great cities were springing up, and in the South cotton cultivation and production grew enormously.

In 1850 the first land grant was made to the Illinois Central system, and thereafter many followed. Both State and Nation contributed to the new development in money and in lands. The Pennsylvania State owned and controlled roads passed into private ownership or leasehold and all roads were now privately owned and controlled.

Extending into undeveloped territory and gambling upon the success of future development and expansion, private capital could not proceed alone and was given State aid in land grants and money, many States contributing liberally for their development that they might be placed in better competition with those sister States which were far ahead in transportation development.

It must be stated in passing that the manner of granting this money and the methods of its use are not matters of pride in the history of railroad building.

Money was wasted. State debts were repudiated. The attempt to keep track of finances in what we now know as an accurate accounting system was futile, or deliberately muddled. Banks as well as the State suffered from a very loose condition, and the outcome was that State aid stopped.

Sharfman, in the American Railroad Problem, states that—the community manifested so marked an eagerness to secure railroad transportation that the States' attitude toward carriers was one of liberality and encouragement.

Cunningham, in American Railroads, says:

Speculative building, with many cases of financial maladministration, unfair discrimination in rates and service, and ruinous competition caused a reversal of public opinion. Open antagonism took the place of friendly cooperation. There was intense resentment against abuse of power exercised by railroad executives and bitter criticism of rates which were regarded as excessively high. * * * The spirit of antagonism * * * crystallized early in the seventies in the drastic legislation known as the granger laws.

These granger laws, most of them unconstitutional, as the courts later ruled, were the means, however, by which the conditions of 1860 to 1870 were brought to a close, and were the foundation upon which later regulation was constructed.

During the period of State aid Congress was inactive, yet later gave more than 33,000,000 acres of land to induce railroad construction on the first line from the Mississippi to the Pacific.

CIVIL WAR AND ANOTHER 10 YEARS

The panic of 1857 was hardly over when the Civil War came, and railroad construction suffered a severe jolt from these two causes.

Had it not been for several consolidations during the period between 1850 and 1860 these two disasters to railroad building might have caused a greater setback. But Vanderbilt and others had united lines into great systems and the capital in-

vestment was able to withstand the shock of depression. An example of such consolidation may be noted in the fact that until Vanderbilt undertook the work of gaining control of the roads between Albany and Buffalo 10 different companies were operating between these two points.

In 1860 the railroads had made remarkable progress. It was a great step from 1840 to 1860 to find the old box cars of four wheels and 34 barrels of flour, switched by horses and pulled by a makeshift engine, replaced by sensible looking carriers. The Concord stage of 1830 on wooden rails and the four-wheel passenger coaches of three compartments each, in which the average-sized man could not stand up straight, had passed into memory.

The period of State aid antedated congressional aid. Even in the fifties Congress was slow to act on land grants. There was a constitutional question involved, leaders said, in the power of Congress to give away its lands to private enterprise.

But in 1862 the hesitancy began to disappear when appeals were made for land grants to construct a line from the Mississippi to the Pacific. There had been keen rivalry as to what route should be taken to the Pacific, but at the time of the secession Congress was in a position to act. In fact, Congress had to act for military purposes, and the East was to be connected with the Pacific via the northern route.

An Illinois grant was the model for subsequent grants. The railroads, in addition to a strip 200 feet wide for a right of way, received 6 square miles of land for each mile of track constructed. Later grants increased the acreage given, and there were certain exceptions to the model grant in subsequent grants.

Under the act of 1862 as amended the grant was 10 square miles to every mile of track laid, but owing to the character of the country through which the road was to run, undeveloped and unpopulated, the grant in fact was not much more attractive than previously made grants of 6 square miles.

The road to the Pacific was undertaken by the Union Pacific, the Kansas Pacific, and the Central Pacific Cos.

Congress granted 33,000,000 acres of land to induce construction of this road.

In all, during the 10-year period of 1861 to 1871, 23 companies were the recipients of grants, including those mentioned and also the Texas & Pacific and Southern Pacific lines.

More than 159,000,000 acres of public lands were offered in this way up to 1871, and all of it accepted, except where the roads were unable to carry out their construction. About 120,000,000 acres actually passed to the roads.

In addition to these land grants the Government loaned money in the form of bonds. This land and bond assistance constitutes a lengthy chapter in America's development.

PERIOD OF STOCK JOBBING

In 1880 there were, despite the handicaps of reconstruction and the panic of 1873, 93,267 miles of railroads in the United States. Thirty-three thousand miles had been added in the five-year period from 1867 to 1873 and only 10,000 in the years 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, and 1878.

But from 1880 to 1890 came by far the most astounding growth of railroads in any country of the world and a growth that will probably mark the greatest achievement in transportation development in the history of the world.

In the United States in these 10 years we added 70,000 miles of railroad to the 93,267 miles of road we had in 1880, and our total at the close of 1890 was 163,597 miles.

Figures compiled by the Joint Commission on Agricultural Inquiry of the Sixty-eighth Congress (p. 319, vol. 3) show that in 1890, the culmination of our greatest decade of railroad building, there was invested in the railroads in road and equipment, in railway capital outstanding and not held by railway companies, \$7,577,000,000.

Here we begin to see the extent of our growing system. This amount in 1890 was as much as the present capital and surplus of all the National and State banks and trust companies of the entire United States, with a billion or more to spare.

What was the result? A scramble for power on the part of the roads and railroad baiting on the part of others. A new problem had grown up with the last few years of the "industry of transportation." All the great lines stretching across the continent several times and from Canada to the Gulf, employing thousands of men, providing for thousands of families, giving labor to hundreds of allied industries, manufactories, and trades, owned by private capital and battling for expansion as well as returns, contended in a dangerous competition for business.

During these years legislative clerks and pages were boastful of their passes; legislatures were bought, directly or indirectly; an army of high-salaried agents invaded many States and the National Capital.

Stock jobbers arose and figures were juggled and garbled. Rebates and discriminations to shippers and jobbers were inevitable in the scramble for supremacy in transportation. Speculative expansion attracted innocent capital looking for dividends. Stock traveled up and down the scale of market manipulations. Railroad barons grew up and others were ruined. Consolidations were effected and mergers announced. Pools ran riot and margins increased. All that the iniquities of the system could invent were recorded in one exposure after another. Reputations were ruined and careers ended.

The orgy of wasteful expenditures in a mad effort to thwart public control was destined to bring about the very thing it sought to forestall. State regulation was inevitable. It came.

STATE REACTION

All of this took place over a long period of years. It began back in the seventies, when legislatures in the Western States were beginning to discuss State rate-making powers. As Vanderblue and Burgess bring out quite clearly in *Railroads—Rates, Service, and Management*, the farmers were blaming the railroads for depressions, as were others. In Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and other States, hard hit by the depression, "regulatory commissions were created largely as a result of this popular protest by the farming classes."

Many years previously in Massachusetts a commission had been created, and in New York also there was a board that lasted for a short period of time. But the Massachusetts body had no authority over the railroads. They were an investigating commission, reported on their findings, and trusted largely to acquiescence on the part of the railroads to what they thought would be public approval to put their recommendations into effect.

In the Western States, however, the commissions were given authority to act. It was a delicate operation to begin, and a more serious problem to finish. Facts were difficult to obtain, and figures were largely elastic. Courts were called upon to interpret and enjoin, and likewise to mandamus and order. The attempt at State rate making and its early success brought about the day of the pass and the legislative lobbyist, for in the last analysis the legislature was probably more plastic than the commission, and in the hands of the legislator finally rested the authority to enlarge or curtail the power of the commission.

The more radical laws in some instances were not obeyed at all by the carriers, and in others only to a degree; and then, when receiverships began to follow depression and road conditions began to get worse rather than better, despite new mileage and new areas reached, it was found that it was not so much a matter of high rates in general as it was what were called discriminatory rates in particular.

These discriminatory rates were taken up by the States with varied results. In some instances both farmers and manufacturers were pleased, and in others one of the two were satisfied, much to the distress of the other, while in other instances neither was entirely served by the new attempt at regulation.

The subject of "intra" and "inter" State rates then came to the forefront of the situation and a new era of investigation and report was ushered in.

NATIONAL CONTROL

It was evident, after careful analysis, that if regulation were to be effective at all, owing to the various classes of shippers and the more varied character of the commodity to be hauled, to say nothing of the extent of the haul, it became apparent that national regulation would have to be given serious consideration.

President Grant, in 1872, had made mention in a message to Congress of the advisability of considering methods of making uniform or fair the cost of transportation of commodities from the Central States to the sea.

But it was not until 1886 that any serious attempt was made in Congress to bring national control. The Senate received a report in which all the complaints against the railroads were exhaustively treated, and a bill was introduced looking to the question of national rate regulation. In 1887 Congress created the national commission for the purpose of regulating commerce, and this act, to a large extent, was based upon the salient provisions of the various State laws, or at least those phases of the State laws which had proved, in the opinion of Congress, effective.

The original national act looking to rate regulation was, in the light of what has transpired since that time, a mere legis-

lative makeshift, of but a few paragraphs rather loosely worded and indicative of a distrust by Congress of its own rate-making power.

The present interstate commerce act is a delicate, technical, document some 200 pages in length, including the various acts and parts of acts relating thereto.

It was not until 1896 that the Supreme Court ruled favorably on the attempt of Congress to control, and the original interstate commerce act simply created an investigating body on the theory that its reports would enforce compliance with public demand by the railroads.

The State commissions had early taken up matters in addition to rates and alleged discriminations. Among them were: (1) Safety of travel, including inspection of equipment, grade separation, automatic control, and so forth; (2) service, including car and freight service, terminals, and the like; (3) liability of the companies to shippers; (4) finances, including periodical valuations and estimated and reasonable returns; (5) construction, including the application of carriers for permission to extend their lines in some instances, and to give up nonproductive lines in others.

From the time that Congress took up the railroad-control subject until the present day all of these matters have been included in rail legislation, and to them have been added the relation between the carrier and employee.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION AND LABOR BOARD

The Interstate Commerce Commission is a board of 11 men, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate of the United States, and as constituted since its inception has enjoyed the services of technical experts and economists, men previously well trained or experienced in the operation of State commissions dealing with roads.

At the present time this board has been extended into a working organization that requires the space of an entire 11-story building in Washington. It has bureaus selected for each of the activities of the board or to carry out its various powers; certain of its operations are grouped in "divisions," and hundreds of employees carry out its functions. An extensive library of thousands of volumes has grown up under its direction and is used daily for reference by its many departments, as well as by the public and by experts.

The divisions of the board are created to handle, first, management and safety; second, rates; third, service in relation to rates; fourth, management; fifth, service as between the roads and with respect to terminals, and so forth.

Allotted to these divisions are the "bureaus," among them being safety, locomotive inspection, valuation, traffic, inquiry, finance, statistics, accounts, service, law, administration, and compensation departments.

There are still other bureaus and there are chiefs, directors, examiners, and technical experts. The arms of the commission extend into the general offices of more than 1,500 railroads and the volume of statistical data collected daily is astounding, all relating to the powers, functions, and activities of the commission.

Since the passage of the original act the interstate commerce law has been amended by Congress in nearly all its phases, each amendment looking to the extension of its powers and duties.

This great body, at first a merely inquisitorial board, now has the power to establish and enforce rates. The penalty of fine and imprisonment was established for failure to carry out the schedule of the commission, and an imprisonment feature of the penalty clause, later removed by the Elkins amendment to the commerce act, was restored by the Hepburn Act under Mr. Roosevelt.

Under the amendments of 1906 the commission's authority was also extended to express companies, sleeping-car companies, pipe-line companies, and all other companies coming under the head of transportation companies, and in this year the commission was empowered to fix maximum rates and dictate the manner in which the roads shall account to the Government for receipts and expenditures.

The acts of 1910 gave the commission authority over cable, telephone, and telegraph companies, and again enlarged its powers of rate making by making it possible for the commission to suspend proposed rate changes of the carriers until after an investigation.

In 1912 the act was amended to give the commission jurisdiction over the traffic incident to the Panama Canal, and for this purpose included all water-rail lines. In 1913 the valuation amendment was made authorizing the commission to survey and estimate the value of the railroad properties of the Nation, and since that date no great change was made except in the passage of the act of 1920 called the transportation act.

By this act the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to State rate-making bodies was finally established. In other words, the unworkable situation of previous years in which both State and Nation were attempting to control rates over the same carriers was ended, and from 1920 the rate-making power has been definitely lodged with the Government of the United States in the commission. The State board which existed in practically every State in the Union all had wide power and still have it. They can compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of records, and do all that is necessary to inquire into both rates, management, and service. But at the present time, while there exist instances of a conflict of authority in the varied phases of the law, there is rather generally a spirit of cooperation between the States and the Nation, and a conceded right to the national commission to make and enforce rates.

WAR, THE RAILROADS, AND AFTER WAR

It is necessary to revert a few years in order to arrive at a clear understanding of the present situation.

In 1916, under Mr. Wilson, with the exigency of war and its necessities at hand, it was apparent that the transportation facilities of the Nation would, as a matter of national defense, have to be thrown together under one management and control, and Congress accordingly, in that year, gave the President the right to take over the carriers. Mr. Wilson later appointed a Director General of Railroads and put into operation Federal management of roads.

Whatever may be said of Government ownership or operation of roads by advocates of that policy, it will have to be admitted that the public, as represented by Congress, paid no attention to the merits of the Government ownership theory by this act. It was a war emergency act.

But when it began to operate we were, in fact, experimenting accidentally in Government ownership.

There are two extreme views in the matter of railroad operation: One, the theory of Government ownership; the other, private ownership without even rate or service control. Thus, in America, between 1870 and 1917, we passed, in fact, however accidentally, from one extreme to the other.

It is true that separate contracts were made with each road taken over, but when competition was eliminated and all roads placed upon an equal basis, Government ownership, to a large extent, was in operation.

There were handicaps, it is true, to the Federal management. Labor was in bad shape numerically and otherwise, and equipment of the roads was run down, and all materials and labor that might have been used in the physical upbuilding of the carriers were needed for the emergencies of war.

So practically the United States operated the roads on the strictly military basis of "As you were," and put into effect such rules and regulations as would systematize transportation and control of it, without going into the physical ability of the roads to bear the burden.

We now come to an interesting chapter in railroading. Previous to 1916 road after road had gone into the hands of receivers. Railroad credit was at a low ebb. Since 1893, when 74 roads, with 29,340 miles of tracks and a bonded and stock indebtedness of \$1,780,000,000, went into the hands of receivers, 356 roads had followed, carrying with them into the courts nearly a hundred thousand miles of rails and billions in stocks and bonds.

Naturally, when the Government took over the railroads, they were in a "run-down" condition. Equipment was in need of repair and replacement; tracks were in the same condition; and, more serious than all else, credit was gone.

Then came the new conditions of war. Labor required more pay, living conditions had changed, and freight and passenger rates had to be "boosted" to meet the demands both of natural extra costs of operation and the new cost of expediting the transportation of armies and munitions.

So the United States, confronted with its problem, was hardly able to do more than to meet each condition as it arose. Wages increased, as did freight and passenger rates.

But there was little time left for reconstruction of the roads or the repairing of credit.

And when this condition dawned upon the Federal Government the war ended and the roads had to be returned to their owners.

Demands were made for an extension of Federal control, but Mr. Wilson was not in favor of it. It was generally conceded that the American public had not approved Government management as a step to Government ownership. The roads had been taken over in the emergency of war, and that emergency having passed they were in justice to be restored.

Mr. Wilson named the date for their restoration to private ownership. The roads could not be returned as one would return a chattel. Property could not be confiscated. Transportation could not be set adrift on its own resources. The problems of reconstruction would strike the railroads hardest. The wage problem had to be dealt with and railroad credit re-established.

To do this in proper manner was the motivating principle back of what turned out to be the transportation act of 1920, the last great amendment to the interstate commerce act.

Be it said to the credit of Congress, as a whole the transportation act was a credit to its capacity, earnestness, and zeal, whatever shortcomings may be found in the act itself. It demonstrated at least a constructive effort to deal with a difficult problem in a limited time.

The two great features of the transportation act will probably be set down as (1) a pledge of Government temporary assistance to the roads to preclude the possibility of a panic and to restore credit to the carriers; (2) the setting up of machinery under which the Interstate Commerce Commission might not only fix maximum rates but might fix minimum rates as well, and for this reason might take control over the causes operating to certain ends with respect to returns on investment. To carry out the theory that the Government should inquire into matters relating to returns of the roads on investments, the Labor Board was created in the hope or on the theory that labor disputes might find settlement through its operation and thus insure continuity of service and proper wage scales.

It was provided, in connection with the first purpose of the transportation act, as well as the second, that the Interstate Commerce Commission in establishing rates should try to fix rates which would, so far as possible, yield a fair rate of return upon the aggregate value of railroad property devoted to public use in each of any rate districts established by the commission.

Essentially the things mentioned were the real objects of the transportation act under which the roads are operating to-day.

It was provided that for two years the roads should receive 5½ per cent return on the aggregate value of property actually used in transportation in such districts. One-half of 1 per cent might be added for improvements. So that 6 per cent was recognized as a fair return. At the expiration of the two-year period of Federal aid to the roads the commission established slightly less than 6 per cent as a return in an attempt to follow this provision in the act.

In handing back the roads it was also provided that the Federal Government would continue its financial aid for a certain period and that the roads in this accounting should reimburse the Government for improvements made during the term of Federal control.

The "recapture" clause of section 15a of the transportation act is not generally understood. It provides that if any road under the rate schedules earns more than the fair return then such excess shall be placed in a reserve fund. One half of this reserve fund may be drawn upon by the road for improvements or dividends, all subject to the approval of the commission, and the other half of excess earnings shall go to a general contingent fund to be expended by the United States through the commission on needed railway improvements or rehabilitation as the commission may from time to time elect.

In 1924 the Supreme Court upheld this clause of the transportation act.

The Labor Board, as constituted by the transportation act, consists of a commission of nine men—three from the carriers, three from the employees, and three from the public. The President appoints all nine men, those from the carriers from six nominations made by the carriers, those from the employees from six nominees of the employees. No nominations are made by the public.

There is provision also for labor boards of adjustment, which may inquire into matters involving grievances or working conditions but which have no jurisdiction in the matter of wages.

The act provides, however, that before any matter shall go before the boards it shall first be the subject of conferences between the parties interested—the carrier or carriers and the employees. If conference fails, then wage disputes go to the Labor Board; and other disputes go to the Labor Board also if the adjustment boards do not exist, for it is provided that the creation of the adjustment boards is voluntary, and either the roads or the employees may refuse to create their portion of such adjustment boards.

The Labor Board provision authorizes the examination of all facts and conditions entering into the dispute and provides for full publicity of all its hearings, discussions, or findings, but no authority is delegated to enforce its decisions.

The hearings before this board in numerous instances and the results of these deliberations, together with the conditions of both sides in particular cases, are matters of public record.

HIGHWAYS

In the last few years a new agency of transportation has entered into the consideration of thoughtful men, an agency that bids fair later to have a distinct bearing on the future of the American railway.

We now have a National and State investment in public highways of \$5,000,000,000, and this year Congress has appropriated \$80,000,000, which must be matched by the States, making a total new investment of \$160,000,000 in the next two years, establishing a policy which will probably be continued.

Already the competition of the motor car has been felt in the interurban lines and in railroad lines of a short-haul character. The motor bus has already resulted at least in a few abandonments of electric-line transportation. Near my own city, through Illinois and Missouri, there are motor coaches extending out into long lines of profitable freight and passenger business. That is a coming problem.

The Department of Agriculture estimated three years ago that 134,000,000 tons of farm produce were hauled over the highways of the Nation in 1921. The shipping of livestock by truck is becoming popular and economical in farming communities, and the transportation of other commodities by truck is increasing daily. At first the truck was a valuable feeder to the railroad, but with the extension of the National and State road programs and the enormous increase in the motor truck and motor car output the competition becomes a factor in the railroad problem.

The motor problem is a study in itself. According to the Joint Agricultural Inquiry Committee of the Sixty-seventh Congress, the registrations of motor vehicles in the Nation in 1911 were 501,000, of which 14,000 were trucks.

Ten years later the registrations were 10,300,000 motor vehicles, of which 1,390,000 were trucks, and to-day there are 15,500,000 registrations, of which 1,831,000 are trucks, with an annual investment in automobiles of \$7,546,000,000.

Every truck in its relation to every mile of paved road becomes a potential factor in the transportation problem, a factor in the future of the American railroad.

WATERWAYS

From 1824 to 1923 the United States spent a total of \$1,150,000,000 on waterways, harbors, rivers, canals, boats, and river service. From 1913 to 1921 the Government spent \$400,000,000 of this sum. There are 6,014 miles of navigable waterways and rivers receiving Government appropriations. Of the total amount spent on waterways, harbors, and canals, about \$400,000,000 has been spent to date by the Government on rivers only.

This does not take into consideration the Shipping Board and its war emergency expenditures of \$2,500,000,000. This refers only to canals, waterways, rivers, and river service which are distinctly competitive subjects in the discussion of the railroad problem.

There is a bill now before Congress to appropriate, for a six-year building program for inland waterways, \$53,000,000.

When these expenditures for waterways are added to the expenditures by the Government and States for highways the public competitive investment becomes enormous.

INVESTMENT AND SERVICE

To-day in the United States there are 258,314 miles of railroads operated. There are 38,692 miles of secondary track and 116,186 miles of terminal and siding tracks, a total of 413,192 miles of trackage, or more than enough to lay rails across the Atlantic 100 times or to span the earth's surface at the Equator in first-class mileage 10 times.

There are 68,990 locomotives, 2,380,482 freight cars, and 57,166 passenger cars. Every man, woman, and child of our 110,000,000 population could be transported at one time if all railroad vehicles were used.

In 1923 the railroads carried 1,387,942,018 tons of freight a distance of 416,211,000,000 miles.

In the same year 1,009,000,000 passengers rode a total distance of 38,297,000,000 miles.

The railroads have a capital of about \$21,000,000,000, or at the rate of about \$89,500 per mile.

The total operating expenses of 1923 were \$4,895,000,000.

The operating revenue, \$6,289,000,000.

There are 1,855,000 employees working on these roads and about 2,000,000 in allied industries, and the number of individual roads reporting to the commission is more than 2,000.

There are 890,000 stockholders in these roads in addition to bondholders and other creditors.

Allowing three to a family, there are 12,000,000 persons depending upon the railroads for money that actually goes directly into their pockets.

These roads burned 131,491,000 tons of soft coal in 1923 and 2,614,000 tons of hard coal, and consumed 2,334,365,000 gallons of oil.

They laid 84,500,000 railroad ties and 3,000,000 tons of steel in replacements and betterments.

Every locomotive costs between \$35,000 and \$75,000, every passenger car \$15,000 to \$30,000, every diner approximately \$50,000, and every freight car from \$1,500 to \$3,500.

The roads loaded nearly 50,000,000 freight cars during the year 1923, and installed 4,160 locomotives, 223,724 freight cars, and 2,534 passenger cars.

NATIONAL VALUATION

In 1913 Congress amended the interstate commerce act by a provision directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to proceed at once to make a valuation of the railroads of the United States, and authorized the commission to divide the Nation into districts to carry out this work.

The commission divided the country into five sections: Eastern, central, western, southern, and Pacific; and three boards were created, with one member on each board from each of the five districts; the first being a board of engineers, the second being a board of land attorneys, and the third a board of accountants.

For the purpose of expediting the valuation, field offices were established and field and office staffs were created. That was 11 years ago.

In 1922 an investigation was begun by Congress as to the cause of the apparent delay in completing this valuation, and it was discovered, for the first time, that the extent of this work was enormous.

To-day a better knowledge of the extent of this work may be obtained. At the peak of this valuation process there were 1,800 men employed by the commission for this work alone.

It must be remembered that there are over 2,000 railroad companies owning physical properties in the United States. These do not all report to the commission individually, but in the valuation process the properties of each of these 2,000 and more roads are to be valued.

This does not mean that the commission may enter the offices of the railroads, examine their financial statements, take the total amount of capital invested, and return this as the valuation of the road.

The commission first notified the roads that such a valuation was to be made, and the roads themselves were required to assist the commission in this work. Special charts, diagrams, and data had to be prepared with respect to every foot of track, every tie and every rail, every locomotive, passenger car, baggage coach, and other equipment—every item relating to this equipment and these physical properties in a financial way was tabulated, and an agent of the commission examined every item in these voluminous financial statements.

The commission was required to travel over much of the 258,000 miles of road in order to determine depreciation, actual cost, cost of replacement, and all the technical matters that enter into a valuation process.

In the 11 years ending in 1924 the army at work under the commission cost the Government nearly \$26,000,000, and the carriers assert that in assisting the Government to arrive at their various valuations the carriers spent three times this amount, or approximately \$75,000,000.

During this period of investigation litigation was unavoidable, and time and again the courts were resorted to in an effort to determine whether the policy of the commission was fair and equitable.

In fixing a fair return as contemplated by the interstate commerce act the actual valuation of the roads will be one of the important factors, but there is wide divergence of opinion even among experts as to the real valuation of a physical property, considering original investment, overhead expense, maintenance, and depreciation.

It is estimated the work of valuing the railroads will be completed by July, 1927.

A bill has been introduced in Congress asking for an appropriation of \$4,135,000 to complete primary valuation reports, and the statement is made by Interstate Commerce Commission experts this will complete the work of valuation so far as the primary valuation is concerned.

The statistical data, charts, maps, and drawings necessary to complete this work will fill to their capacity the space of more than 50 rooms, and if reduced to volumes would constitute several thousand.

The book cost of road and equipment by all classes of carriers reported in 1919 was as follows:

Eastern group	\$9,038,194,615
Southern group	2,183,923,124
Western group	8,818,454,872

Total of groups..... 20,040,572,611

The commission's estimate was—

Eastern group	\$8,800,000,000
Southern group	2,000,000,000
Western group	8,100,000,000

Total..... 18,900,000,000

RATES AND FAIR RETURN

I quote from the testimony of John J. Esch before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on May 21, 1924:

Section 15a (3) provides that after March 1, 1922, the commission shall "from time to time determine and make public what percentage of such aggregate property constitutes a fair return thereon, and such percentage shall be uniform for all rate-group territories which may be designated by the commission."

* * * The provisions of section 15a have been framed in recognition of constitutional guaranties of fair return upon property devoted to public use. They also declare the policy of Congress "in its control of interstate commerce system * * * to make the system adequate to the needs of the country by securing for it a reasonable compensatory return for all the work it does."

* * * Section 15a, reasonably construed, contemplates the determination of a return which the carriers, collectively or in rate groups, may attain over a period of time under rates adjusted from time to time with that object in view. The phrase "from time to time" does not mean that we should adjust and readjust rates to meet business fluctuations. Whether carriers may be able to earn an aggregate net railway operating income equal to a fair return must depend to a large extent upon business conditions. In the Wisconsin case the court said: "The new measure imposed an affirmative duty on the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix rates and to take other important steps to maintain an adequate railway service for the people of the United States."

* * * In numerous cases cited courts and regulating authorities of States have recognized that public utilities and railroads may be permitted individually to earn, under reasonable rates, at least 6 per cent upon fair value.

* * * In our view railway corporations should, like other corporations, pay their Federal income taxes out of the income rather than collect it in effect from the public in the form of transportation charges adjusted to enable it to retain a designated fair return over and above the tax. We may observe that a fair return of 5.75 per cent, representing an aggregate annual net railway operating income arrived at after deducting, among other things, the Federal income tax on a return of 6 per cent, would be approximately the equivalent of a fair return of 6 per cent, out of which the Federal income tax was payable.

CONSOLIDATION OF RAILROADS

From the very earliest days there have been continuous consolidations of railroads, the number of individual roads gradually decreasing.

President Coolidge, in his last message to Congress on this subject, said:

In my message last year I emphasized the necessity for further legislation with a view to expediting the consolidation of our railways into larger systems. The principle of Government control of rates and profits, now thoroughly embedded in our governmental attitude toward natural monopolies such as the railways, at once eliminates the need of competition by small units as a method of rate adjustment. Competition must be preserved as a stimulus to service, but this will exist and can be increased under enlarged systems. Consequently the consolidation of the railways into larger units for the purpose of securing the substantial values to the public which will come from larger operation has been the logical conclusion of Congress in its previous enactments and is also supported by the best opinion in the country. Such consolidation will assure not only a greater element of competition as to service, but it will afford economy in operation, greater stability in railway earnings, and more economical financing. It opens large possibilities of better equalization of rates between different classes of traffic so as to relieve undue burdens upon agricultural products and raw materials generally, which are now not possible without ruin to small units, owing to the lack of diversity of traffic. It would also tend to equalize earnings in such fashion as to reduce the importance of section 15a, at which criticism, often misapplied, has been directed. A smaller number of units would offer less difficulties in labor adjustments and would contribute much to the solution of terminal difficulties.

There is now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a bill providing for consolidation of the railroads into several great systems.

COST OF PUBLIC OWNERSHIP

The Government can not, without paying for it, take over nor confiscate this enormous property, valued at approximately \$20,000,000,000, nor could it take over without withdrawing from the States and Nation \$350,000,000 annually in taxes.

In 1911 the class I railroads paid taxes amounting to \$98,626,000. In 1920 State taxes had risen to \$232,000,000 and Federal taxes mounted to \$50,000,000, a total of \$282,000,000, or an increase of 175.7 per cent over the year 1911.

In 1923 the roads paid \$332,000,000 in taxation to the State and Federal Governments, and for 1924 will pay over \$350,000,000.

SUMMARY

Summarizing the 96 years of development in the railroads we find:

1. A joint attempt at building between private capital and State and National aid.
2. The abandonment of State and National aid and the passing early in our history of roads into the hands of private capital.
3. The attempt and the failure of States to regulate rates; this having been demonstrated to be essentially a national function.
4. The roads are now largely directed by men of extended experience who have grown up in the railroad business, nearly all advancing by merit from minor positions.
5. Railroad stock, formerly owned by a few, is now held by hundreds of thousands of citizens, in many cases representing a lifetime saving.
6. The Government's effort to secure a proper valuation of railroads and promise of completion in 1927.
7. The right of the Interstate Commerce Commission to make rates has been established by the courts; limited, however, to rates insuring a fair return upon investment.
8. Practically everything connected with the railroads is now regulated: Rates, service, safety appliances, extensions, issuance of stock, issuance of bonds, consolidations, abandonments, locomotive and car inspection, accounting systems, reports, investigation of management, excess profits, connections with ports, rail and water commerce, valuations, liability of carriers.
9. The matter of further consolidation is now under consideration.
10. Investment in highways of \$5,000,000,000 and yearly investment of State and Nation of \$80,000,000.
11. National investment in inland waterways, canals, and harbors of \$1,150,000,000, and we contemplate an additional expenditure of \$53,000,000.

If I have in this statement shown the magnitude of the subject, the efforts of State control, the extent of the present national control, and have emphasized the tremendous development and the number of citizens dependent upon the roads for financial stability, I may have aroused an interest which will cause a more thorough study, extending to thousands of volumes.

Before making changes Congress, with the light of experience, should know what has gone before, ascertain the extent and limitation of its powers, so that it may approach this subject with thorough understanding.

[NOTE].—For those who desire a more complete study of railroad problems I refer to the sources of my own information, namely, Government Regulation of Railway Rates, by Hugo Meyer; Our Railroads To-morrow, by Edward Hungerford; Principles of Railroad Transportation, by Johnson and Van Metre; American Railroads, by Cunningham; Government Ownership of Railroads, by Dunn; The Business of Railway Transportation, by Lewis Haney; Railroads—Rates, Service, Management, by Vanderblue and Burgess; the excellent works of Professor Hadley; decisions of the Labor Board, 1921 and 1922; hearings of Senate committee on S. 2327; hearings before House committee, May, 1924; current report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; the transportation act of 1920, as amended and revised and compiled; and three volumes of the congressional hearings on the return of the railroads to private management.

EXTENDING APPROPRIATION, COLUMBIA BASIN INVESTIGATION

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 157 and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and pass the Senate joint resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 157, extending appropriation in connection with Columbia Basin investigation

Resolved, etc., That the unexpended balance of the appropriation contained in the act of March 4, 1923 (42 Stat. L. p. 1540), making appropriations for investigation of the feasibility of irrigation by gravity or pumping, water sources, water storage, and related problems in connection with Columbia Basin project, is hereby reappropriated and made available immediately and to continue available until the investigation is completed.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The Chair was told that it would be a bill limiting it to February 15, but the bill as read says "until the investigation is completed."

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Until the report is completed, and the Secretary believes it will be completed by the 1st of February, or perhaps the 15th.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Is this an emergency matter?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I would be very glad to state this appropriation was made a year and a half ago, requiring a report on the 31st of this month. I have a letter from the Secretary of the Interior which says the report is not completed, and will not be for some weeks yet. There are several scientific men preparing the report, and this is to continue the little balance of that appropriation so they can go ahead and complete the report, which will be ready within a few weeks; otherwise the appropriation will be no longer available.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. When Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee left he advised me that there would not be anything coming up after Calendar Wednesday except the naval appropriation bill. That is my understanding also from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Mr. LONGWORTH. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. When Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee left he advised me that nothing would come up this week except the naval appropriation bill, and that is also my understanding from the gentleman from Ohio. I would like the matter to go over until the gentlemen interested in the matter can have an opportunity to look into it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will say to the gentleman from Texas I was not aware of the general purpose, but being a question of unanimous consent—

Mr. GARNER of Texas. If the Speaker does not want to take the responsibility of declining to give unanimous consent himself for the present, I will do it myself, and ask that it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will not the gentleman permit me to read a very short statement from the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Put it in the Record and we will have it to-morrow.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. But we will have no session.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. We are bound to have a session to-morrow.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have told a number of gentlemen who made inquiry that there will be no business to-morrow after the appropriation bill was through.

The statement of the Secretary is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,

Washington, December 18, 1924.

Hon. JOHN W. SUMMERS,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SUMMERS: Under the act of February 21, 1923, I was authorized to investigate and report on what is known as the Columbia Basin reclamation project, and an appropriation of \$100,000 was made for this purpose under the act of March 4, 1923 (42 Stat. 1540), available until December 31, 1924.

The engineers and economists in charge of the preparation of data for the final report advise me that it will be impossible for them to complete their work so as to enable me to submit my report by the date the appropriation expires. It was my purpose to submit a final report on this matter on or before December 31, 1924, but now find that such a report can not be submitted before February 1, 1925, and it may possibly be the 15th of that month. I believe, therefore, that it would be advisable to extend the time during which the funds appropriated will be available for this purpose so as to cover any expenses

incurred after December 31, 1924. The exact amount of the unexpended balance can not be stated, on account of unreported expenditures.

This matter is called to your attention in order that proper action may be taken by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT WORK.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I would rather have this go over to to-morrow. If it can be done by unanimous consent, it can be done to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the bill is not in the form he understood it was in. He understood it ought to be limited to February 15.

AIR MAIL SERVICE

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I am impelled to say a word for record in support of the bill authorizing the Postmaster General to extend the Air Mail Service. My State, which is my district, lies on the air mail route from New York to San Francisco. There are air mail plane stations at Cheyenne, Laramie, Rawlins, Rock Springs, and Evanston, all in Wyoming. There are revolving, sweeping signal lights interspersed across the 365 miles of valley, plain, and mountains, from the eastern to the western boundary of the State. The highest is on Sherman Hill, at an altitude of 8,600 feet, the Continental Divide.

It has been my fortune to have witnessed last fall air mail planes arriving at and leaving the Wyoming stations. It is an inspiration and brings a thrill to see these rigid-winged machines sweeping through the air lanes over these tremendous stretches of one of the Commonwealths of this great Nation and to realize that it is a part of a system operating from ocean to ocean. It is a striking demonstration of the marvelous ingenuity, the resourcefulness, the skill, and the bravery of the American people and its citizen employees.

This service has not been without its sacrifices of human life. Twice air mail pilots have made the supreme sacrifice in the crashing of their planes against the high head of Elk Mountain, in my State, when darkness or snowstorms have confused their course and obscured their objective. It was with gratification and a feeling of security for the lives of our courageous pilots that on many nights across the breadth of my State, from auto or from train, on the Union Pacific route, I saw the great shafts of light sweeping across the heavens, the signals beckoning them safely from station to station in the dark hours of the night. Like great eagles, symbolizing the power, genius, and swiftness of the United States, the mail planes descended from the darkness and again ascended into the night and swept onward.

They carry across the Nation at amazing speed the messages of business, of society, and of the home. They link in swift contact the East and the West. They dwarf the Nation to a span. They bring our people nearer to each other. They render incalculable service in the commercial world; but, greater than this, they solidify, they unite, as never before, the utmost sections of our broad land. They will weave, as this service is extended over the whole country in time, a thousand strands daily into the common fabric of the Union.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, December 20, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

747. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of legislation making available not to exceed \$275,000 of the existing appropriations for river and harbor works for the purpose of making surveys of the St. Lawrence River and the preparation of plans and estimates by the United States section of the Government Board of Engineers on the St. Lawrence River (H. Doc. No. 498); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

748. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a report for the month of November, 1924, showing the condition of railroad equipment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

749. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Mulberry Fork of the Warrior River above Sanders Shoals, Ala.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 10982. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1056). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BUTLER: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 9112. A bill for the relief of Commander Charles James Anderson, United States Naval Reserve Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 1057). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BUTLER: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 9228. A bill for the relief of Charles Ritzel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1058). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BERGER: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 1579. A bill authorizing the disposition of certain lands in Minnesota; with amendments (Rept. No. 1059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STEPHENS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1446. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Gibson, alias Charles J. McGibb; without amendment (Rept. No. 1060). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STEPHENS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 10670. A bill for the relief of Frederick S. Easter; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1061). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9946) granting a pension to Harry E. Pangburn; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10854) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Cannon; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10795) granting an increase of pension to Gideon C. Lewis; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10896) granting an increase of pension to Samantha A. Carnefix; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 10982) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 10983) providing for the leasing of restricted Indian allotments for a period not exceeding 10 years; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 10984) declaring Flint River above Albany, Ga., nonnavigable; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 10985) limiting the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, relating to the retirement of captains in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 10986) to authorize cooperative agreements between the heads of the executive depart-

ments and the Governor of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 10087) to advance the Naval Establishment with a view to meeting the 5-5-3 ratio promoted by the Washington arms conference, and to authorize an increase in the limits of cost of certain naval vessels, and to provide for the construction of additional vessels; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 10988) to provide for dividing the State of South Carolina into three judicial districts, for the appointment of a district judge, district attorney, and marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina, for the holding of the terms of court in said districts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 312) extending appropriation in connection with Columbia Basin investigations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 10989) granting an increase of pension to Anna Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10990) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe E. Betts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10991) granting an increase of pension to Elvesta E. Carper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10992) granting an increase of pension to Katie Krieger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10993) granting an increase of pension to Maria E. Witter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTNESS: A bill (H. R. 10994) granting a pension to John M. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 10995) granting a pension to Jennie E. Buckley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10996) granting a pension to Tamar Ervin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 10997) granting a pension to Mary A. Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 10998) granting an increase of pension to Henry De Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 10999) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11000) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Frost; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11001) for the relief of Arthur E. Colgate, administrator of Clinton C. Colgate, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11002) for the relief of Peter Myer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11003) granting an increase of pension to George Sparks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 11004) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Hight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 11005) granting a pension to Sarah Ladson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 11006) granting an increase of pension to Susan Bryson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11007) granting a pension to Hattie A. Cruson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 11008) granting a pension to Eliza A. Corbett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOWREY: A bill (H. R. 11009) for the relief of James M. Conner; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 11010) granting an increase of pension to Margaret McCullough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 11011) for the relief of Thomas A. Heard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11012) granting an increase of pension to Louisa L. Littler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 11013) granting a pension to Albert S. Riddle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11014) granting an increase of pension to Frank L. Snoots; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 11015) granting an increase of pension to Silas Rogers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11016) granting a pension to Polly Couch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11017) granting a pension to Catron Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUBBY: A bill (H. R. 11018) granting a pension to John T. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 11019) granting an increase of pension to Mary Griffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11020) granting a pension to Margaret Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 11021) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11022) granting an increase of pension to Henry Y. Staton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 11023) granting a pension to Arthur Raymond; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11024) granting a pension to Elizabeth Jamison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11025) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11026) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Gomes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 11027) granting an increase of pension to Abby E. Trussell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRY: Resolution (H. Res. 386) to pay Mary V. O'Toole and Conrad P. Kahn, clerks to the late Hon. Julius Kahn, one month's salary; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3266. By Mr. ANDREW: Petition of Army and Navy Union, Charlestown, Mass., urging passage of bills increasing pensions of Civil and Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

3267. By Mr. GUYER: Petition of sundry citizens of Franklin County, Kans., protesting the passage of Senate bill 3218, known as the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3268. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Ottawa, Kans., objecting to the passage of Senate bill 3218, known as the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3269. By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of citizens of Mahaska, Monroe, and Wapello Counties, State of Iowa, opposing the passage of Senate bill 3218 or any other religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3270. By Mr. VARE: Memorial of Philadelphia Board of Trade, urging passage of the McFadden bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3271. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition of residents of Gratiot County, Mich., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

SATURDAY, December 20, 1924

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we draw near to Thee this morning, and while we bless the hand that has been guiding our way we wish to return to Thee thanks especially at this season of the year. To some there may be a sense of loneliness attached to it that makes them think of others with them formerly, but we pray that Thou, "strong Son of God, immortal love," may be near in the presence of these lonely experiences, multiplying to each the joy of Christmas time in heart and in the experiences through which they may be passing.